HOLY NAMES UNIVERSITY
PAUL J. CUSHING LIBRARY
library.hnu.edu
34681000990348



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/textbookofhistor0000adfh_u6v0

COLLEGE HISTORIES OF ART

EDITED BY

JOHN C. VAN DYKE, L H.D.

HISTORY OF ARCHITECTURE

A. D. F. HAMLIN

COLLEGE HISTORIES OF ART

EDITED BY

JOHN C. VAN DYKE, L.H.D.

PROFESSOR OF THE HISTORY OF ART IN RUTGERS COLLEGE

HISTORY OF PAINTING

By JOHN C. VAN DYKE, the Editor of the Series. With Frontispiece and 110 Illustrations, Bibliographies, and Index. Crown 8vo, $1.50.

HISTORY OF ARCHITECTURE

By ALFRED D. F. HAMLIN, A.M., Professor of the History of Architecture, Columbia University, New York. With Frontispiece and 235 Illustrations and Diagrams, Bibliographies, Glossary, Index of Architects, and a General Index. Crown 8vo, $2.00.

HISTORY OF SCULPTURE

By ALLAN MARQUAND, Ph.D., L.H.D., Professor of Art and Archaeology in Princeton University, and ARTHUR L. FROTHINGHAM, Jr., Ph.D. With Frontispiece and 113 Illustrations. Crown 8vo, $1.50.



THE PARTHENON, ATHENS, AS RESTORED BY CH. CHIPIEZ.

(From model in Metropolitan Museum, New York.)

A TEXT-BOOK

OF THE

HISTORY OF ARCHITECTURE

BY

A. D. F. HAMLIN, A.M.

PROFESSOR OF THE HISTORY OF ARCHITECTURE IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

EIGHTH EDITION

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH ST., NEW YORK
LONDON, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA
1911

NA
200
H2
1911
c 3

Copyright, 1895, by
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

All rights reserved.

Copyright, 1909, by
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

All rights reserved.

05577

First Edition, March, 1896.
Reprinted and Revised, December, 1896; December, 1898; October, 1900; October, 1902; September, 1904; June, 1906; November, 1907; January, 1909.
Eighth Edition, September, 1909; Reprinted, November, 1911.

Press of J. J. Little & Ives Co.
425–435 East 24th Street, New York

PREFACE TO FIRST EDITION.

The aim of this work has been to sketch the various periods and styles of architecture with the broadest possible strokes, and to mention, with such brief characterization as seemed permissible or necessary, the most important works of each period or style. Extreme condensation in presenting the leading facts of architectural history has been necessary, and much that would rightly claim place in a larger work has been omitted here. The danger was felt to be rather in the direction of too much detail than of too little. While the book is intended primarily to meet the special requirements of the college student, those of the general reader have not been lost sight of. The majority of the technical terms used are defined or explained in the context, and the small remainder in a glossary at the end of the work. Extended criticism and minute description were out of the question, and discussion of controverted points has been in consequence as far as possible avoided.

The illustrations have been carefully prepared with a view to elucidating the text, rather than for pictorial effect. With the exception of some fifteen cuts reproduced from Lübke's *Geschichte der Architektur* (by kind permission of Messrs. Seemann, of Leipzig), the illustrations are almost all entirely new. A large number are from original drawings made by myself, or under my direction, and the remainder are, with a few exceptions, half-tone

reproductions prepared specially for this work from photographs in my possession. Acknowledgments are due to Messrs. H. W. Buemming, H. D. Bultman, and A. E. Weidinger for valued assistance in preparing original drawings; and to Professor W. R. Ware, to Professor W. H. Thomson, M.D., and to the Editor of the Series for much helpful criticism and suggestion.

It is hoped that the lists of monuments appended to the history of each period down to the present century may prove useful for reference, both to the student and the general reader, as a supplement to the body of the text.

A. D. F. Hamlin.

Columbia College, New York,
January 20, 1896.

PREFACE TO THE EIGHTH EDITION.

The architectural achievements of the past fourteen years, the notable advances in the archæology of the art and the growth of its literature, have made imperative a careful revision of the text of this little work. It has, however, seemed wise not to expand unduly the matter of the volume, but to confine the revision to the correction of errors, and the addition of such new matter as was necessary to bring the entire text up to date. Some of the illustrations have been re-drawn and a few new ones added; the bibliographies have been revised and the lists of monuments corrected and in some cases considerably expanded. The form and appearance of the book have not been changed, but it is believed that it is now more reliable and accurate, and more nearly abreast with the present-day conditions of and knowledge concerning architecture than ever before. Having been printed from new plates a little more closely than the earlier editions, it is but little larger than they, although containing a considerable amount of new matter. In the work of revision the author desires to acknowledge gratefully his especial obligations to Professor J. T. Shotwell of Columbia University for suggestions and corrections regarding historical matters, and his appreciation of the aid rendered by all who have sent their criticisms or called attention to errors in the book.

A. D. F. Hamlin.

The School of Architecture,
Columbia University, New York,
June 24, 1909.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE

PREFACE TO FIRST EDITION v

PREFACE TO EIGHTH EDITION vii

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS xiii

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY xxi

INTRODUCTION xxiii

CHAPTER I.

PRIMITIVE AND PREHISTORIC ARCHITECTURE 1

CHAPTER II.

EGYPTIAN ARCHITECTURE 6

CHAPTER III.

EGYPTIAN ARCHITECTURE, *Continued* 16

CHAPTER IV.

CHALDÆAN AND ASSYRIAN ARCHITECTURE 28

CHAPTER V.

PERSIAN, LYCIAN, AND JEWISH ARCHITECTURE 35

CHAPTER VI.

GREEK ARCHITECTURE 42

CHAPTER VII. PAGE

GREEK ARCHITECTURE, *Continued* 61

CHAPTER VIII.

ROMAN ARCHITECTURE 75

CHAPTER IX.

ROMAN ARCHITECTURE, *Continued* 88

CHAPTER X.

EARLY CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE 110

CHAPTER XI.

BYZANTINE ARCHITECTURE 120

CHAPTER XII.

SASSANIAN AND MOHAMMEDAN ARCHITECTURE — ARABIAN, MORESQUE, PERSIAN, INDIAN, AND TURKISH . . . 135

CHAPTER XIII.

EARLY MEDIÆVAL ARCHITECTURE IN ITALY AND FRANCE . . 155

CHAPTER XIV.

EARLY MEDIÆVAL ARCHITECTURE IN GERMANY, GREAT BRITAIN, AND SPAIN 174

CHAPTER XV.

GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE 185

CHAPTER XVI.

GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE IN FRANCE 199

CHAPTER XVII. PAGE

GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE IN GREAT BRITAIN 222

CHAPTER XVIII.

GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE IN GERMANY, THE NETHERLANDS, AND SPAIN 242

CHAPTER XIX.

GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE IN ITALY 259

CHAPTER XX.

EARLY RENAISSANCE ARCHITECTURE IN ITALY 275

CHAPTER XXI.

RENAISSANCE ARCHITECTURE IN ITALY—THE ADVANCED RENAISSANCE AND DECLINE 292

CHAPTER XXII.

RENAISSANCE ARCHITECTURE IN FRANCE 314

CHAPTER XXIII.

RENAISSANCE ARCHITECTURE IN GREAT BRITAIN AND THE NETHERLANDS 334

CHAPTER XXIV.

RENAISSANCE ARCHITECTURE IN GERMANY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL 346

CHAPTER XXV.

THE CLASSIC REVIVALS IN EUROPE 363

CHAPTER XXVI.

PAGE

Recent Architecture in Europe 376

CHAPTER XXVII.

Architecture in the United States 395

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Oriental Architecture—India, China, and Japan . . 416

Glossary 433

Index of Architects 437

Index 445

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

THE authorship of the original drawings is indicated by the initials affixed: A. = drawings by the author; B. = H. W. Buemming; Bn. = H. D. Bultman; Ch. = Château, *L'Architecture en France;* G. = drawings adapted from Gwilt's *Encyclopædia of Architecture;* L. = Lübke's *Geschichte der Architektur;* S. = Simpson's *History of Architectural Development;* W. = A. E. Weidinger. All other illustrations are from photographs.

PAGE

FRONTISPIECE. The Parthenon Restored (from model in Metropolitan Museum, New York)

1 Section of Great Pyramid (A.) 8
2 Section of King's Chamber (A.) 9
3 Plan of Sphinx Temple (A.) 9
4 Ruins of Sphinx Temple (A.) 10
5 Tomb at Abydos (A.) 11
6 Tomb at Beni-Hassan (A.) 11
7 Section and Half-plan of same (A.) 12
8 Plan of the Ramesseum (A.) 14
9 Temple of Edfou. Plan (B.) 17
10 Temple of Edfou. Section (B.) 17
11 Temple of Karnak. Plan (L.) 18
12 Central Portion of Hypostyle Hall at Karnak (from model in Metropolitan Museum, New York) 20
13 Great Temple of Ipsamboul 21
14 Edfou. Front of Hypostyle Hall 23
15 Osirid Pier (Medinet Abou) (A.) 24
16 Types of Column (A.) 25
17 Egyptian Floral Ornament-Forms (A.) 26
18 Palace of Sargon at Khorsabad. Plan (L.) . . . 30
19 Gate, Khorsabad (A.) 32
20 Assyrian Ornament (A.) 34
21 Column from Persepolis (B.) 37
22 Lion Gate at Mycenæ (A.) 44

PAGE

23 Polygonal Masonry, Mycenæ (A.) 45
24 Tholos of Atreus; Plan and Section (A.) 46
25 Tholos of Atreus, Doorway (after Phené Spiers) (A.) . 46
26 Greek Doric Order (A.) 49
27 Doric Order of the Parthenon. (From cast in Metropolitan Museum, New York) 50
28 Greek Ionic Order, Miletus (A.) 52
29 Side View of Ionic Capital (B.) 53
30 Greek Corinthian Order (A.) 54
31 Types of Greek Temple Plans (A.) 55
32 Carved Anthemion Ornament, Athens 58
33 Temple of Zeus, Agrigentum; Plan (A.) 62
34 Ruins of the Parthenon 64
35 Plan of the Erechtheum (A.) 65
36 West End of the Erechtheum; Restored (A.) . . . 66
37 Propylæa at Athens. Plan (G.) 66
38 Choragic Monument of Lysicrates. (From model in Metropolitan Museum, New York) 68
39 Temple of Olympian Zeus, Athens. Plan (A.) . . . 69
40 Plan of Greek Theatre (A.) 71
41 Mausoleum at Halicarnassus (A.) 73
42 Roman Doric Order from Theatre of Marcellus. (Model in Metropolitan Museum, New York) 78
43 Roman Ionic Order (A.) 79
44 Roman Corinthian Order. (From model in Metropolitan Museum, New York) 80
45 Roman Arcade with Engaged Columns (A.) . . . 81
46 Barrel Vault (A.) 82
47 Groined Vault (A.) 82
48 Roman Wall Masonry (B.) 84
49 Roman Carved Ornament. (Lateran Museum) . . . 86
50 Roman Ceiling Panels (A.) 87
51 Temple of Fortuna Virilis. Plan 89
52 Circular Temple, Tivoli (A.) 90
53 Temple of Venus and Rome. Plan (A.) 93
54 Plan of the Pantheon (B.) 94
55 Interior of the Pantheon 95
56 Exterior of the Pantheon. (Model in Metropolitan Museum, New York) 96
57 Forum and Basilica of Trajan (A.) 97

PAGE

58 Basilica of Constantine. Plan (G.) 98
59 Ruins of Basilica of Constantine 99
60 Central Block, Thermæ of Caracalla. Plan (G.) . . 100
61 Roman Theatre, Herculanum 101
62 Colosseum at Rome. Half Plan (A.) 102
63 Arch of Constantine. (Model in Metropolitan Museum, New York) 103
64 Palace of Diocletian, Spalato. Plan (G.) 105
65 Plan of House of Pansa, Pompeii (A.) 106
66 Plan of Santa Costanza, Rome (A.) 111
67 Plan of the Basilica of St. Paul-beyond-the-Walls, Rome (A.) 113
68 St. Paul-beyond-the-Walls. Interior 114
69 Church at Kalb Louzeh (A.) 116
70 Cathedral at Bozrah. Plan (A.) 117
71 Diagram of Pendentives (A.) 123
72 Spandril, Hagia Sophia 125
73 Capital with Impost Block, S. Vitale 126
74 Plan of St. Sergius, Constantinople (A.) 127
75 Plan of San Vitale, Ravenna (S.) 127
76 Plan of Hagia Sophia, Constantinople (A.) 128
77 Section of Hagia Sophia (A.) 128
78 Interior of Hagia Sophia (full page) 129
79 Plan of St. Mark's, Venice (A.) 132
80 Interior of St. Mark's 133
81 Mosque of Sultan Hassan, Cairo. Sanctuary . . . 137
82 Mosque of Kaîd Bey, Cairo 139
83 Moorish Detail, Alhambra 141
84 Interior of Great Mosque, Cordova 142
85 Plan of the Alhambra (A.) 144
86 Tomb of Mahmûd, Bijapur. Section (A.) 147
87 The Taj Mahal, Agra 149
88 Mosque of Mehmet II., Constantinople. Plan (L.) . 151
89 Exterior of Ahmediyeh Mosque, Constantinople . . . 152
90 Interior of Suleimaniyeh Mosque, Constantinople . . 153
91 Interior of San Ambrogio, Milan 157
92 Plan of San Michele, Pavia (A.) 158
93 West Front and Campanile, Cathedral of Piacenza . . 159
94 Baptistery, Cathedral, and Leaning Tower, Pisa . . . 160
95 Interior of Pisa Cathedral 161

PAGE
96 Plan of St. Front, Perigueux (G.) 166
97 Interior of St. Front (L.) 167
98 Plan of Notre Dame du Port, Clermont (Ch.) . . . 167
99 Section of same (Ch.) 168
100 Plan of St. Sernin, Toulouse (A.) 168
101 A Six-part Ribbed Vault (A.) 169
102 Plan of Minster at Worms (G.) 175
103 One Bay, Cathedral of Spires (L.) 176
104 East End, Church of the Apostles, Cologne 177
105 Plan of Durham Cathedral (Bn.) 179
106 One Bay, Transept of Winchester Cathedral (G.) . . 180
107 Front of Iffley Church (A.) 181
108 Constructive System of Gothic Church (A.) . . . 186
109 Plan of Sainte Chapelle, Paris (Bn.) 187
110 Early Gothic Flying Buttress (Bn.) 188
111 Ribbed Vault, English Type (Bn. after Babcock) . . 189
112 Penetrations and Intersections of Vaults (Bn.) . . . 190
113 Plate Tracery, Charlton-on-Oxmore 191
114 Bar Tracery, St. Michael's, Warfield (W.) 192
115 Rose Window from St. Ouen, Rouen (G.) 193
116 Flamboyant Detail, Strasburg 194
117 Early Gothic Carving (A.) 195
118 Carving, Decorated Period, from Southwell Minster . . 196
119 Plan of Notre Dame, Paris (L.) 201
120 Interior of Notre Dame 202
121 Interior of Le Mans Cathedral 203
122 Vaulting with Zigzag Ridge Joints (A.) 204
123 One Bay, Abbey of St. Denis (G.) 206
124 The Sainte Chapelle, Paris. Exterior 207
125 Amiens Cathedral. Plan (G.) 208
126 Alby Cathedral. Plan (A. after Lübke) 209
127 West Front of Notre Dame, Paris 210
128 West Front of St. Maclou, Rouen 211
129 French Gothic Capitals (A.) 213
130 Openwork Gable, Rouen Cathedral 214
131 North Porch, Chartres Cathedral 215
132 House of Jacques Cœur, Bourges (L.) 218
133 Plan of Salisbury Cathedral (Bn.) 223
134 Ribbed Vaulting, Choir of Exeter Cathedral . . . 225
135 Lierne Vaulting, Tewkesbury Abbey 226

PAGE

136 Vault of Chapter House, Wells 227
137 Cloisters of Salisbury Cathedral 229
138 Perpendicular Tracery, St. George's, Windsor . . . 230
139 West Front, Lichfield Cathedral 232
140 One Bay of Choir, Lichfield Cathedral (A.) . . . 233
141 Fan Vaulting, Henry VII.'s Chapel 235
142 Eastern Part, Westminster Abbey. Plan (L.) . . . 236
143 Roof of Nave, St. Mary's, Westonzoyland (W.) . . 238
144 One Bay, Cathedral of St. George, Limburg (L.) . . 244
145 Section of St. Elizabeth, Marburg (Bn.) 245
146 Cologne Cathedral. Plan (G.) 247
147 Church of Our Lady, Treves (L.) 248
148 Plan of Ulm Cathedral (L.) 249
149 Town Hall, Louvain 252
150 Façade of Burgos Cathedral 253
151 Detail from S. Gregorio, Valladolid 255
152 Duomo at Florence. Plan (G.) 261
153 Duomo at Florence. Nave 262
154 One Bay, Cathedral of S. Martino, Lucca (L.) . . . 263
155 Interior of Sienna Cathedral 264
156 Façade of Sienna Cathedral 266
157 Exterior of the Certosa, Pavia 267
158 Plan of the Certosa, Pavia 268
159 Upper Part of Campanile, Florence 269
160 Upper Part of Palazzo Vecchio, Florence 270
161 Loggia dei Lanzi, Florence 271
162 West Front of Doge's Palace, Venice 272
163 Capital, Palazzo Zorzi, Venice 280
164 Section of Dome, Duomo of Florence (Bn.) . . . 281
165 Exterior of Dome, Duomo of Florence 282
166 Interior of S. Spirito, Florence 283
167 Court of Riccardi Palace, Florence 284
168 Façade of Strozzi Palace, Florence 285
169 Tomb of Pietro di Noceto, Lucca 287
170 Vendramini Palace, Venice 289
171 Façade of Giraud Palace, Rome (L.) 295
172 Plan of Farnese Palace, Rome (L.) 296
173 Court of Farnese Palace, Rome 297
174 Bramante's Plan for St. Peter's, Rome (L.) . . . 299
175 Plan of St. Peter's, Rome, as now standing (Bn. after G.) 300

PAGE

176 Interior of St. Peter's (full page) 301
177 Library of St. Mark, Venice 306
178 Interior of San Severo, Naples 307
179 Church of Santa Maria della Salute, Naples . . . 308
180 Court Façade, East Wing of Blois 317
181 Staircase Tower, Blois 319
182 Plan of Château of Chambord (A.) 320
183 Upper Part of Château of Chambord 320
184 Detail of Court of Louvre, southwest portion . . . 322
185 The Luxemburg Palace, Paris 324
186 Colonnade of the Louvre 327
187 Dome of the Invalides, Paris 328
188 Façade of St. Sulpice, Paris 329
189 Plan of Panthéon, Paris (G.) 330
190 Exterior of Panthéon, Paris 331
191 Burghley House 336
192 Whitehall Palace, the Banqueting Hall 337
193 Plan of St. Paul's Cathedral, London (G.) 338
194 Exterior of St. Paul's Cathedral 339
195 Plan of Blenheim (G.) 340
196 St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, London 341
197 Renaissance Houses, Brussels 343
198 Schloss Hämelschenburg 349
199 The Friedrichsbau, Heidelberg Castle 351
200 Pavilion of Zwinger Palace, Dresden 353
201 Marienkirche, Dresden 354
202 Portal of University, Salamanca 357
203 Court (Patio) of Casa de Zaporta 358
204 Palace of Charles V., Granada 359
205 Façade of British Museum, London 365
206 St. George's Hall, Liverpool 366
207 The Old Museum, Berlin 368
208 The Propylæa, Munich 369
209 Arch of Triumph of l'Étoile, Paris 371
210 The Madeleine, Paris 372
211 Door of École des Beaux-Arts, Paris 373
212 St. Isaac's Cathedral, St. Petersburg 374
213 Plan of Louvre and Tuileries (A.) 379
214 Pavilion Richelieu, Louvre 380
215 Grand Staircase, Paris Opera House 381

PAGE

216 Fountain of Longchamps, Marseilles 382
217 Galliéra Museum, Paris 383
218 Royal Theatre, Dresden 384
219 Maria-Theresienhof, Vienna 385
220 Houses of Parliament, London 387
221 Assize Courts, Manchester 388
222 Natural History Museum, South Kensington . . . 389
223 Christ Church, Philadelphia 398
224 Craigie House, Cambridge (Mass.) 399
225 National Capitol, Washington 401
226 Old Custom House, New York (National City Bank) . 402
227 Trinity Church, Boston 406
228 Public Library, Woburn (Mass.) 407
229 Times Building, New York 409
230 Country House at Nyack, N. Y. 410
231 Country House in Colonial Style 412
232 Porch of Temple of Vimalah Sah, Mount Abu . . . 421
233 Tower of Victory, Chittore 422
234 Double Temple at Hullabîd: Detail 425
235 Shrine of Soubramanya, Tanjore 427

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY.

(This includes the leading architectural works treating of more than one period or style. The reader should consult also the special references at the head of each chapter. Valuable material is also contained in the leading architectural periodicals and in monographs too numerous to mention.)

Dictionaries and Encyclopedias.

Agincourt, *History of Art by its Monuments;* London.

Architectural Publication Society, *Dictionary of Architecture;* London.

Bosc, *Dictionnaire raisonné d'architecture;* Paris.

Gwilt, *Encyclopedia of Architecture;* London and New York.

Longfellow and Frothingham, *Cyclopedia of Architecture in Italy and the Levant;* New York.

Planat, *Encyclopédie d'architecture;* Paris.

Sturgis, *Dictionary of Architecture and Building;* New York.

General Handbooks and Histories.

Blomfield, *The Mistress Art;* London.

Bühlmann, *Die Architektur des klassischen Alterthums und der Renaissance;* Stuttgart. (Also in English, published in New York.)

Choisy, *Histoire de l'architecture;* Paris.

Durand, *Recueil et parallèle d'édifices de tous genres;* Paris.

Durm and others, *Handbuch der Architektur;* Stuttgart. (This is an encyclopedic compendium of architectural knowledge in many volumes; the series not yet complete. It is referred to as the *Hdbuch. d. Arch.*)

Fergusson, *History of Architecture in All Countries;* London.

Fletcher and Fletcher, *A History of Architecture;* London.

Gailhabaud, *L'Architecture du Vme. au XVIIIme. siècle;* Paris. —*Monuments anciens et modernes;* Paris.

Gosset, *Les Coupoles d'orient et d'occident;* Paris.

Isabelle, *Les Edifices circulaires et les domes;* Paris.

Kugler, *Geschichte der Baukunst;* Stuttgart.

Lübke, *Geschichte der Architektur;* Leipzig.—*History of Art,* tr. and rev. by R. Sturgis; New York.

Michel, *Histoire de l'Art.*

Perry, *Chronology of Mediæval and Renaissance Architecture;* London.

Reynaud, *Traité d'architecture;* Paris.

Roger-Peyre, *Répertoire chronologique de l'histoire des Beaux-Arts.*

Rosengarten, *Handbook of Architectural Styles;* London and New York.

Simpson, *A History of Architectural Development,* vols. i. and ii.; London and New York.

Spiers, *Architecture East and West;* London.

Statham, *Architecture for General Readers;* London.

Sturgis, *European Architecture;* New York,—*A History of Architecture,* vol. i.; New York.

Transactions of the Royal Institute of British Architects; London.

Viollet-le-Duc, *Discourses on Architecture;* Boston.

Theory, the Orders, etc.

Chambers, *A Treatise on Civil Architecture;* London.

Esquié, *Traité élémentaire d'architecture;* Paris.

Guadet, *Théorie de l'architecture;* Paris.

Jackson, *Reason in Architecture;* London.

Ruskin, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture;* London.

Sturgis, *How to Judge Architecture;* New York.

Ware, *The American Vignola;* Scranton.

HISTORY OF ARCHITECTURE.

INTRODUCTION.

A HISTORY of architecture is a record of man's efforts to build beautifully. The erection of structures devoid of beauty is mere building, a trade and not an art. Edifices in which strength and stability alone are sought, and in designing which only utilitarian considerations have been followed, are properly works of engineering. Only when the idea of beauty is added to that of use does a structure take its place among works of architecture. We may, then, define architecture as the art which seeks to harmonize in a building the requirements of utility and of beauty. It is the most useful of the fine arts and the noblest of the useful arts. It touches the life of man at every point. It is concerned not only in sheltering his person and ministering to his comfort, but also in providing him with places for worship, amusement, and business; with tombs, memorials, embellishments for his cities, and other structures for the varied needs of a complex civilization. It engages the services of a larger portion of the community and involves greater outlays of money than any other occupation except agriculture. Everyone at some point comes in contact with the work of the architect, and from this universal contact architecture derives its significance as an index of the civilization of an age, a race, or a people.

It is the function of the historian of architecture to trace the origin, growth, and decline of the architectural styles which have prevailed in different lands and ages, and to show how they have

reflected the great movements of civilization. The migrations, the conquests, the commercial, social, and religious changes among different peoples have all manifested themselves in the changes of their architecture, and it is the historian's function to show this. It is also his function to explain the principles of the styles, their characteristic forms and decoration, and to describe the great masterpieces of each style and period.

STYLE is a quality; the "historic styles" are phases of development. *Style* is character expressive of definite conceptions, as of grandeur, gaiety, or solemnity. An *historic style* is the particular phase, the characteristic manner of design, which prevails at a given time and place. It is not the result of mere accident or caprice, but of intellectual, moral, social, religious, and even political conditions. Gothic architecture could never have been invented by the Greeks, nor could the Egyptian styles have grown up in Italy. Each style is based upon some fundamental principle springing from its surrounding civilization, which undergoes successive developments until either it reaches perfection or its possibilities are exhausted, after which a period of decline usually sets in. This is followed either by a reaction and the introduction of some radically new principle leading to the evolution of a new style, or by the final decay and extinction of the civilization and its replacement by some younger and more virile element. Thus the history of architecture appears as a connected chain of causes and effects succeeding each other without break, each style growing out of that which preceded it, or springing out of the fecundating contact of a higher with a lower civilization. To study architectural styles is therefore to study a branch of the history of civilization.

Technically, architectural styles are identified by the means they employ to cover enclosed spaces, by the characteristic forms of the supports and other members (piers, columns, arches, mouldings, traceries, etc.), and by their decoration. The **plan** should receive special attention, since it shows the arrangement of the

points of support, and hence the nature of the structural design. A comparison, for example, of the plans of the Hypostyle Hall at Karnak (Fig. 11, *h*) and of the Basilica of Constantine (Fig. 58) shows at once a radical difference in constructive principle between the two edifices, and hence a difference of style.

STRUCTURAL PRINCIPLES. All architecture is based on one or more of four fundamental structural principles; that of the *lintel*, of the *arch* or *vault*, of the *truss*, and of *cohesive* construction. The principle of the **lintel** is that of resistance to transverse strains, and appears in all construction in which a single cross-piece or beam rests on two or more vertical supports. The **arch** or **vault** makes use of several pieces to span an opening between two supports. These pieces are in compression and exert lateral pressures or *thrusts* which are transmitted to the supports or abutments. The thrust must be resisted either by the massiveness of the abutments or by the opposition to it of counter-thrusts from other arches or vaults. Roman builders used the first, Gothic builders the second of these means of resistance. The **truss** is a framework so composed of several pieces of wood or metal that each shall best resist the particular strain, whether of tension or compression, to which it is subjected, the whole forming a compound beam. It is especially applicable to very wide spans, and is the most characteristic feature of modern construction.

The fourth principle, that of the **cohesion** of materials shaped while plastic, and hardening or "setting" into a homogeneous structural unit, although known to the Romans and employed by them in a limited way, has within recent years undergone an extraordinarily rapid development. It employs concrete, made of cement and small stones or other like material, moulded while plastic into the necessary structural forms and supplied with bars, rods or wires of metal buried in the concrete to take up any and all tensile strains in the beams or slabs subject to transverse pressure, and which the concrete alone is ill-fitted to resist. The

applications of this system are known by various names grouped under the generic term "reënforced concrete." While its most rapid development has been in works of pure engineering, its applications to architecture are being daily multiplied and it is sure to exert a marked influence as the design of the coming years. How the adoption of one or another of these principles affected the forms and even the decoration of the various styles will be shown in the succeeding chapters.

HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT. Geographically and chronologically, architecture appears to have originated in the Nile valley. A second centre of development is found in the valley of the Tigris and Euphrates, not uninfluenced by the older Egyptian art. A third centre of artistic culture, later in date than the two just mentioned, has been in recent years discovered to have existed in Crete. Through various channels the Greeks inherited from all three civilizations, the several influences being discernible even through the strongly original aspect of Greek architecture. The Romans in turn, adopting the external details of Greek architecture, transformed its substance by substituting the Etruscan arch for the Greek construction of columns and lintels. They developed a complete and original system of construction and decoration and spread it over the civilized world, which has never wholly outgrown or abandoned it.

With the fall of Rome and the rise of Constantinople these forms underwent in the East another transformation, called the Byzantine, in the development of Christian domical church architecture. In the North and West, meanwhile, under the growing institutions of the papacy and of the monastic orders and the emergence of a feudal civilization out of the chaos of the Dark Ages, the constant preoccupation of architecture was to evolve from the basilica type of church a vaulted structure, and to adorn it throughout with an appropriate dress of constructive and symbolic ornament. Gothic architecture was the outcome of this preoccupation and it prevailed throughout northern and

western Europe until nearly or quite the close of the fifteenth century.

During this fifteenth century the Renaissance style matured in Italy, where it speedily triumphed over Gothic fashions and produced a marvellous series of civic monuments, palaces, and churches, adorned with forms borrowed or imitated from classic Roman art. This influence spread through Europe in the sixteenth century, and ran a course of two centuries, after which a period of servile classicism was followed by a rapid decline in taste. To this succeeded the eclecticism and confusion of the nineteenth century, to which the rapid growth of new requirements and development of new resources have largely contributed.

In Eastern lands three great schools of architecture have grown up contemporaneously with the above phases of Western art; one under the influence of Mohammedan civilization, another in the Brahman and Buddhist architecture of India and the third in China and Japan. The first of these is the richest and most important. Primarily inspired in large measure from Byzantine art, always stronger on the decorative than on the constructive side, it has given to the world the mosques and palaces of Northern Africa, Moorish Spain, Persia, Turkey, and India. The other two schools seem to be wholly unrelated to the first, and have no affinity with the architecture of Western lands.

Of Mexican, Central American, and South American architecture so little is known, and that little is so remote in history and spirit from the styles above enumerated, that it belongs rather to archæology than to architectural history, and will not be considered in this work.

CHAPTER I.

PRIMITIVE AND PREHISTORIC ARCHITECTURE.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: Desor, *Les constructions lacustres du lac de Neufchatel.* Fergusson, *Rude Stone Monuments.* R. C. Hoare, *Ancient Wiltshire.* Lyell, *The Antiquity of Man.* Lubbock, *Prehistoric Times.* Nadaillac, *Prehistoric America.* Rougemont, *L'age du Bronze.* Tylor, *Primitive Culture.* Waring, *Stone Monuments, Tumuli and Ornament of Remote Ages.*

EARLY BEGINNINGS. It is impossible to trace the early stages of the process by which true architecture grew out of the first rude attempts of man at building. The oldest existing monuments of architecture—those of Chaldæa and Egypt—belong to an advanced civilization. The rude and elementary structures built by savage and barbarous peoples, like the Hottentots or the tribes of Central Africa, are not in themselves works of architecture, nor is any instance known of the evolution of a civilized art from such beginnings. So far as the monuments testify, no savage people ever raised itself to civilization, and no primitive method of building was ever developed into genuine architecture, except by contract with some existing civilization of which it appropriated the spirit, the processes, and the forms. How the earliest architecture came into existence is as yet an unsolved problem.

PRIMITIVE ARCHITECTURE is therefore a subject for the archæologist rather than the historian of art, and needs here only the briefest mention. If we may judge of the condition of the primitive races of antiquity by that of the savage and barbarous peoples of our own time, they required only the simplest kinds of

buildings, though the purposes which they served were the same as those of later times in civilized communities. A hut or house for shelter, a shrine of some sort for worship, a stockade for defence, a cairn or mound over the grave of the chief or hero, were provided out of the simplest materials, and these often of a perishable nature. Poles supplied the framework; wattles, skins or mud the walls; thatching or stamped earth the roof. Only the simplest tools were needed for such elementary construction. There was ingenuity and patient labor in work of this kind; but there was no planning, no fitting together into a complex organism of varied materials shaped with art and handled with science. Above all, there was no progression toward higher ideals of fitness and beauty. Rudimentary art displayed itself mainly in objects of worship, or in the decorations of canoes and weapons, executed as talismans to ward off misfortune or to charm the unseen powers; but even this art was sterile and never grew of itself into civilized and progressive art.

Yet there must have been at some point in the remote past an exception to this rule. Somewhere and somehow the first civilized people, perhaps of Egypt, either in Egypt or in some earlier ancestral home, must have developed from crude beginnings the architectural knowledge and resource which meet us in the oldest monuments, though every vestige of that early age has apparently perished. But although nothing has come down to us of the actual work of the builders who wrought in the primitive ages of mankind, there exist throughout Europe and Asia almost countless monuments of a primitive character belonging to relatively recent times, but executed before the advent of historic civilization to the regions where they are found. A general resemblance among them suggests a common heritage of traditions from the hoariest antiquity, and throws light on the probable character of the transition from barbaric to civilized architecture.

PREHISTORIC MONUMENTS. These monuments vary widely in age as well as in excellence· some of them belong to

Roman or even Christian times; others to a much remoter period. They are divided into two principal classes, the megalithic structures and lake dwellings. The latter class may be dismissed with the briefest mention. It comprises a considerable number of very primitive houses or huts built on wooden piles in the lakes of Switzerland and several other countries in both hemispheres, and forming in some cases villages of no mean size. Such villages, built over the water for protection from attack, are mentioned by the writers of antiquity and portrayed on Assyrian reliefs. The objects found in them reveal an incipient but almost stationary civilization, extending back from three thousand to five thousand years or more, and lasting through the ages of stone and bronze down into historic times.

The **megalithic** remains of Europe and Asia are far more important. They are very widely distributed, and consist in most cases of great blocks of stone arranged in rows, circles, or avenues, sometimes with huge lintels resting upon them. Upright stones without lintels are called *menhirs;* standing in pairs with lintels they are known as *dolmens;* the circles are called *cromlechs.* Some of the stones are of gigantic size, some roughly hewn into shape; others left as when quarried. Their age and purpose have been much discussed without reaching positive results. It is probable that, like the lake dwellings, they cover a long range of time, reaching from the dawn of recorded history some thousands of years back into the unknown past, and that they were erected by races which have disappeared before the migrations to which Europe owes her present populations. That most of them were in some way connected with the worship of these prehistoric peoples is generally admitted; but whether as temples, tombs, or memorials of historical or mythical events cannot, in all cases, be positively asserted. They were not dwellings or palaces, and very few were even enclosed buildings. They are imposing by the size and number of their immense stones, but show no sign of advanced art, or of conscious striving after beauty of design.

The small number of "carved stones," bearing singular ornamental patterns, symbolic or mystical rather than decorative in intention, really tends to prove this statement rather than to controvert it. It is not impossible that the dolmens were generally intended to be covered by mounds of earth. This would group them with the tumuli referred to below, and point to a sepulchral purpose in their erection. Some antiquaries, Fergusson among them, contend that many of the European circles and avenues were intended as battle-monuments or trophies.

There are also **walls** of great antiquity in various parts of Europe intended for fortification; the most important of these in Greece and Italy will be referred to in later chapters. They belong to a more advanced art, some of them even deserving to be classed among works of archaic architecture.

The **tumuli,** or burial mounds, which form so large a part of the prehistoric remains of both continents, are interesting to the architect only as revealing the prototypes of the pyramids of Egypt and the subterranean tombs of Mycenæ and other early Greek centres. The piling of huge cairns or commemorative heaps of stone is known from the Scriptures and other ancient writings to have been a custom of the greatest antiquity. The pyramids and the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus are the most imposing and elaborate outgrowths of this practice, of which the prehistoric tumuli are the simpler manifestations.

These crude and elementary products of undeveloped civilizations have no place, however, in any list of genuine architectural works. They belong rather to the domain of archæology and ethnology, and have received this brief mention only as revealing the beginnings of the builder's art, and the wide gap that separates them from that genuine architecture which forms the subject of the following chapters.

MONUMENTS. The most celebrated in England are at Avebury, an avenue, large and small circles, barrows, and the great tumuli of Bartlow and Silbury "Hills"; at Stonehenge, on Salisbury

Plain, great megalithic circles and many barrows; "Sarsen stones" at Ashdown; tumuli, dolmens, chambers, and circles in Derbyshire. In Ireland, many cairns and circles. In Scotland, circles and barrows in the Orkney Islands. In France, Carnac and Lokmariaker in Brittany are especially rich in dolmens, circles, and avenues. In Scandinavia, Germany, and Italy, in India and in Africa, are many similar remains.

CHAPTER II.

EGYPTIAN ARCHITECTURE.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: Breasted, *A History of Egypt from the Earliest Times.* Brugsch Bey, *Egypt under the Pharaohs.* Champollion, *Monuments de l'Egypte et de la Nubie.* Choisy, *L'art de bâtir chez les Egyptiens.* Jomard, *Description de l'Egypte, Antiquités.* Lepsius, *Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien.* Mariette, *Monuments of Upper Egypt.* Maspéro, *Egyptian Archæology.* Perrot and Chipiez, *History of Art in Ancient Egypt.* Prisse d'Avennes, *Histoire de l'art égyptien.* Petrie, *History of Egypt; The Pyramids and Temples of Gizeh; Ten Years' Digging in Egypt*, 1881–91. Rawlinson, *History of Ancient Egypt.* Reber, *History of Ancient Art.* Rossellini, *Monumenti del Egitto.* Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs of Ancient Egyptians.* (Also many other titles under Mariette, Maspéro, Naville, and Petrie.)

LAND AND PEOPLE. As long ago as 6000 B.C., the Egyptians were a people already highly civilized, and skilled in the arts of peace and war. The narrow valley of the Nile, fertilized by the periodic overflow of the river, was flanked by rocky heights, nearly vertical in many places, which afforded abundance of excellent building stone, while they both isolated the Egyptians and protected them from foreign aggression. At the Delta, however, the valley widened out, with the falling away of these heights, into broad lowlands, from which there was access to the outer world. Originally divided into two kingdoms, the whole country as far as to Nubia was united under one monarchy at a period variously estimated as from 3500 to 4500 years B.C., under a dynasty known as the first of a series of twenty-six preserved to us in the dynastic lists of Manetho, a priest of the first century A.D.

Menes is the traditional name of the first king of the first dynasty to rule over both Upper and Lower Egypt.

The art history of Egypt may be divided into five periods as follows:*

I. The Ancient Empire (cir. 3400–2160 B.C.), comprising the first ten dynasties, with Memphis as the capital.

II. The First Theban Monarchy or Middle Empire (2160–1788 B.C.), comprising the eleventh and twelfth dynasties reigning at Thebes.

The Hyksos invasion or incursion of the Shepherd Kings interrupted the current of Egyptian art history for a period, with other disturbances, of some two hundred years.

III. The Second Theban Monarchy (1588–1150 B.C.), comprising the eighteenth, nineteenth and part of the twentieth dynasty, was the great period of Egyptian history; the age of conquests and of vast edifices.

IV. The Decadence and Saitic Periods (1150–324 B.C.), comprising the remaining dynasties to and including the twenty-sixth, reigning at Tanis, Bubastis and Sais, and the Persian conquest; a period almost barren of important monuments.

(Periods III. and IV. constitute together the period of the New Empire, if we omit the Persian dominion.)

V. The Revival (from 324 B.C. to cir. 330 A.D.) comprises the Ptolemaic or Macedonian and Roman dominations.

THE ANCIENT EMPIRE: THE PYRAMIDS. The great works of this period are almost exclusively sepulchral, and include the most ancient buildings of which we have any remains. While there is little of strictly architectural art, the overwhelming size and majesty of the Pyramids, and the audacity and skill shown in their construction, entitle them to the first place in any sketch

*The dates are those given by Breasted; those assigned by Flinders Petrie are several centuries earlier for the earlier dynasties.

of this period. They number over a hundred, scattered in six groups, from Abu-Roash in the north to Meidoum in the south, and are of various shapes and sizes. They are all royal tombs and belong to the first twelve dynasties; each contains a sepulchral chamber, and each at one time possessed a small chapel adjacent to it, but this has, in almost every case, perished.

Three pyramids surpass all the rest by their prodigious size; these are at Ghizeh and belong to the fourth dynasty. They are



FIG. 1.—SECTION OF GREAT PYRAMID.
a, King's Chamber; b, Queen's Chamber; c, Chamber cut in Rock.

known by the names of their builders; the oldest and greatest being that of **Cheops,** or Khufu;* the second, that of **Chephren,** or Khafra; and the third, that of **Mycerinus,** or Menkhaura. Other smaller ones stand at the feet of these giants.

The base of the "Great Pyramid" measures 764 feet on a side; its height is 482 feet, and its volume must have originally been nearly three and one-half million cubic yards (Fig. 1). It is constructed of limestone upon a plateau of rock levelled to receive it, and was finished externally, like its two neighbors, with a coating of polished stone, supposed by some to have been disposed in

* The Egyptian names known to antiquity are given here first in the more familiar classic form, and then in the Egyptian form.

bands of different colored granites, but of which it was long ago despoiled. It contained three principal chambers and an elaborate system of inclined passages, all executed in finely cut granite and limestone. The sarcophagus was in the uppermost chamber, above which the superincumbent weight was relieved by open spaces and a species of rudimentary arch of $\wedge$-shape (Fig. 2). The other two pyramids differ from that of Cheops in the details of their arrangement and in size, not in the principle of their construction. Chephren is 454 feet high, with a base 717 feet square. Mycerinus, which still retains its casing of pink granite, is but 218 feet in height, with a base 253 feet on a side.

FIG. 2.—SECTION OF KING'S CHAMBER.

Among the other pyramids there is considerable variety both of type and material. At Sakkarah is one 190 feet high, constructed in six unequal steps on a slightly oblong base measuring nearly 400 $\times$357 feet. It was attributed by Mariette to Ouenephes, of the first dynasty, though now more generally ascribed to Senefrou of the third. At Abu-Seir and Meidoum are other stepped pyramids; at Dashour is one having a broken slope, the lower part steeper than the upper. Several at Meroë with unusually steep slopes belong to the Ethiopian dynasties of the Decadence. A number of pyramids are built of brick.



FIG. 3.—PLAN OF SPHINX TEMPLE.

TOMBS. The Ancient Empire has also left us a great number of tombs of the type known as *Mastabas*. These are oblong rectangular structures of stone or brick with slightly inclined sides and flat ceilings. They uniformly face the east, and are internally divided into three parts: the chamber or chapel, the *serdab*, and the well. In the first of these, next the entrance, were placed the offerings made to the *Ka* or "double," for whom also scenes of festivity or worship were carved and painted on its walls to minister to his happiness in his incorporeal life. The serdabs, or secret inner chambers, of which there were several in each mastaba, contained statues of the defunct, by which the existence and identity of the Ka were preserved. Finally came the well, leading to the mummy chamber, deep underground, which contained the sarcophagus. The sarcophagi, both of this and later ages, are good examples of the minor architecture of Egypt; many of them are panelled in imitation of wooden construction and richly decorated with color, symbols, and hieroglyphs.

OTHER MONUMENTS. Two other monuments of the Ancient Empire also claim attention: the **Sphinx** and the adjacent so-called **"Sphinx temple"** at Ghizeh. The first of these, a huge sculpture carved from the rock, represents Harmachis in the form of a human-headed lion. It is ordinarily partly buried in the sand; is 70 feet long by 66 feet high, and forms one of the most striking monuments of Egyptian art. Close to it lie the nearly buried ruins of the temple once supposed to be that of the Sphinx, but now proved by Petrie to have been erected in connection with the second pyramid. The plan and present aspect of this venerable edifice are shown in Figs. 3 and 4. The hall was roofed with stone lintels carried on sixteen

FIG. 4.—RUINS OF SPHINX TEMPLE.

square monolithic piers of alabaster. The whole was buried in a rectangular mass of masonry and revetted internally with alabaster, but was wholly destitute internally as well as externally of decoration or even of mouldings. With the exception of scanty remains of a few of the pyramid-temples or chapels, and the temple discovered by Petrie in Meidoum, it is the only survival from the temple architecture of that early age.



FIG. 5.—TOMB AT ABYDOS.

THE MIDDLE EMPIRE: TOMBS. The monuments of this period, as of the preceding, are almost wholly sepulchral. We now encounter two types of tombs. One, structural and pyramidal, is represented by many examples at Abydos, the most venerated of all the burial grounds of Egypt (Fig. 5). All of these are built of brick, and are of moderate size and little artistic interest. The second type is that of tombs cut in the vertical cliffs of the west bank of the Nile Valley. The entrance to these faces eastward as required by tradition; the remoter end of the excavation pointing toward the land of the Sun of Night. But such tunnels only become works of architecture when, in addition to the customary mural paintings, they receive a decorative treatment in the design of their structural forms. Such a treatment ap-

FIG. 6.—TOMB AT BENI-HASSAN.

pears in several tombs at Beni-Hassan, in which columns are reserved in cutting away the rock, both in the chapel-chambers and in the vestibules or porches which precede them. These columns are polygonal in some cases, clustered in others. The former type, with eight, sixteen, or thirty-two sides (in these last the *arrises* or edges are emphasized by a slight concavity in each face, like embryonic fluting), have a square abacus, suggesting the Greek Doric order, and giving rise to the name *proto-Doric* (Fig. 6). Columns of this type are also found at Karnak, Kalab-



FIG. 7.—SECTION AND HALF-PLAN OF A TOMB AT BENI-HASSAN.

shé, Amada, and Abydos. A reminiscence of primitive wood construction is seen in the dentils over the plain architrave of the entrance, which in other respects recalls the triple entrances to certain mastabas of the Old Empire. These dentils are imitations of the ends of rafters, and to some archæologists suggest a wooden origin for the whole system of columnar design. But these rock-cut shafts and heavy architraves in no respect resemble wooden prototypes, but point rather to an imitation cut in the rock of a well-developed, pre-existing system of stone construction, some of whose details, however, were undoubtedly derived from early methods of building in wood. The vault was below the chapel and reached by a separate entrance. The serdab was

replaced by a niche in which was the figure of the defunct carved from the native rock. Some of the tombs employed in the chapel-chamber columns of quatrefoil section with capitals like clustered buds (Fig. 7), and this type became in the next period one of the most characteristic forms of Egyptian architecture.

TEMPLES. Of the temples of this period only two have left any remains of importance. Both belong to the twelfth dynasty (cir. 2000 B.C.). Of one of these many badly shattered fragments have been found in the ruins of Bubastis; these show the clustered type of lotus-bud column mentioned above. The other, of which a few columns have been identified among the ruins of the Great Temple at Karnak, constituted the oldest part of that vast agglomeration of religious edifices, and employed columns of the so-called proto-Doric type. From these remains it appears that structural stone columns as well as those cut in the rock were used at this early period (2000 B.C.). Indeed, it is probable that the whole architectural system of the New Empire was based on models developed in the age we are considering; that the use of multiplied columns of various types and the building of temples of complex plan adorned with colossal statues, obelisks, and painted reliefs were perfectly understood and practised in this period. But the works it produced have perished, having been most probably demolished to make way for the more sumptuous edifices of later times.

THE NEW EMPIRE. This was the grand age of Egyptian architecture and history. An extraordinary series of mighty men ruled the empire during a long period following the expulsion of the Hyksos usurpers. The names of Thothmes, Amenophis, Hatasu,* Seti, and Rameses † made glorious the eighteenth and

* More correctly written Thutmosis, Amen-hotep, Hatshepsut.

† While it is now known that Rameses II. carved his own cartouche on many works erected under his predecessors, enough great works—chiefly temples—are indisputably of his reign to entitle him to rank among the greatest builder-monarchs of history.

nineteenth dynasties. Foreign conquests in Ethiopia, Syria, and Assyria enlarged the territory and increased the splendor of the empire. The majority of the most impressive ruins of Egypt belong to this period, and it was in these buildings that the characteristic elements of Egyptian architecture were brought to perfection and carried out on the grandest scale.



FIG. 8.—PLAN OF THE RAMESSEUM.

a, Sanctuary; b, Hypostyle Hall; c, Second court; d, Entrance court; e, Pylons.

TOMBS OF THE NEW EMPIRE. Some of these are structural, others excavated; both types displaying considerable variety in arrangement and detail. The rock-cut tombs of Bab-el-Molouk, among which are twenty-five royal sepulchres, are striking both by the simplicity of their openings and the depth and complexity of their shafts, tunnels, and chambers. From the pipe-like length of their tunnels they have since the time of Herodotus been known by the name *syrinx*. Every precaution was taken to lead astray and baffle the intending violator of their sanctity. They penetrated hundreds of feet into the rock; their chambers, often formed with columns and vault-like roofs, were resplendent with colored reliefs and ornament destined to solace and sustain the shadowy Ka until the soul itself, the Ba, should arrive before the tribunal of Osiris, the Sun of Night. Most impressively do these brilliant pictures,* intended to be forever shut away from human eyes, attest the sincerity of the Egyptian belief and the conscientiousness of the art which it inspired.

* See Van Dyke's *History of Painting*, Figure 1.

While the tomb of the private citizen was complete in itself, containing the Ka-statues and often the chapel, as well as the mummy, the royal tomb demanded something more elaborate in scale and arrangement. In some cases external structures of temple-form took the place of the underground chapel and serdab. The royal effigy, many times repeated in painting and sculpture throughout this temple-like edifice, and flanking its gateways with colossal seated figures, made buried Ka-statues unnecessary. Of these sepulchral temples three are of the first magnitude. They are that of **Queen Hatasu** (XVIIIth dynasty) at Deir-el-Bahari; that of **Rameses II.** (XIXth dynasty), the **Ramesseum,** near by to the southwest; and that of **Rameses III.** (XXth dynasty) at Medinet Abou still further to the southwest. Like the tombs, these were all on the west side of the Nile; so also was the sepulchral temple of Amenophis III. (XVIIIth dynasty), the **Amenopheum,** of which hardly a trace remains except the two seated colossi which, rising from the Theban plain, have astonished travellers from the times of Pausanias and Strabo down to our own. These mutilated figures, one of which has been known ever since classic times as the "vocal Memnon," are 56 feet high, and once flanked the entrance to the forecourt of the temple of Amenophis. The plan of the Ramesseum, with its sanctuary, hypostyle hall, and forecourts, its pylons and obelisks, is shown in Figure 8, and may be compared with those of other temples given on pp. 17 and 18. That of Medinet Abou resembles it closely. The Ramesseum occupies a rectangle of 590×182 feet; the temple of Medinet Abou measures 500×160 feet, not counting the extreme width of the entrance pylons. The temple of Hatasu at Deir-el-Bahari is partly excavated and partly structural, a model which is also followed on a smaller scale in several lesser tombs. Such an edifice is called a *hemispeos*.

CHAPTER III.

EGYPTIAN ARCHITECTURE—*Continued.*

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: Same as for Chapter II.

TEMPLES. The surpassing glory of the New Empire was its great temples. Some of them were among the most stupendous creations of structural art. To temples rather than palaces were the resources and energies of the kings devoted, and successive monarchs found no more splendid outlet for their piety and ambition than the founding of new temples or the extension and adornment of those already existing. By the forced labor of thousands of fellaheen (the system known as the *corvée* and abolished only in recent years under British rule), architectural piles of vast extent could be erected within the lifetime of a monarch. As in the tombs the internal walls bore pictures for the contemplation of the Ka, so in the temples the external walls, for the glory of the king and the delectation of the people, were covered with colored reliefs reciting the monarch's glorious deeds. Internally the worship and attributes of the gods were represented in a similar manner, in endless iteration.

THE TEMPLE SCHEME. This is admirably shown in the temple of Khonsu, at Karnak, built by Rameses III. (XXth dynasty), and in the temple of Edfou (Figs. 9 and 10), though this belongs to the Ptolemaic period. It comprised a sanctuary or *sekos*, a hypostyle (columnar) hall, known as the "hall of assembly," and a forecourt preceded by a double pylon or gateway. Each of these parts might be made more or less complex in different temples, but the essential features are encountered every-

where under all changes of form. The primitive conception of the temple was no doubt that of the house or dwelling of the deity, and this combination of courts, halls, passages and chambers was probably the mere amplification of the plans of early royal palaces, modified and extended to meet the requirements of the Egyptian ritual. The building of a temple began with the sanctuary, which contained the shrine of the god, with subordinate rooms for the priests. These chambers were low, dark, mysterious, accessible only to the priests and king. They were given a certain dignity by being raised upon a sort of platform above the general level, and reached by a few steps. They were sumptuously decorated internally with ritual pictures in relief. The hall was sometimes loftier, but set on a slightly lower level; its massive columns supported a roof of stone lintels, and light was admitted either through clearstory windows under the roof of a central portion higher than the sides, as at Karnak, or over a low screen-wall built between the columns of the front row, as at Edfou and Denderah.



FIG. 9.—TEMPLE OF EDFOU. PLAN.



FIG. 10.—TEMPLE OF EDFOU. SECTION.

This method was peculiar to the Ptolemaic and Roman periods. The court was usually surrounded by a single or double colonnade; sometimes, however, this colonnade only flanked the sides or fronted the hall, or again was wholly wanting. The *pylons* were twin buttress-like masses flanking the entrance gate of the court. They were shaped like oblong truncated pyramids, crowned by flaring cornices, and were decorated on the outer face with masts carrying banners, with obelisks, or with seated colossal figures of the royal builder. An avenue of



FIG. 11.—TEMPLE OF KARNAK. PLAN.

sphinxes formed the approach to the entrance, and the whole temple precinct was surrounded by a wall, usually of crude brick, pierced by one or more gates with or without pylons. The piety of successive monarchs was displayed in the addition of new hypostyle halls, courts, pylons, or obelisks, by which the temple was successively extended in length, and sometimes also in width, by the increased dimensions of the new courts. The great Temple of Karnak most strikingly illustrates this growth. Begun by Osourtesen (XIIth dynasty) nearly 2000 years B.C., it was not completed in its present form until the time of the Ptolemies, when the last of the pylons and external gates were erected.

The variations in the details of this general type were numerous. Thus, at El Kab, the temple of Amenophis III. has the sekos and

hall but no forecourt. At Deir-el-Medineh the hall of the Ptolemaic Hathor-temple is a mere porch in two parts, while the enclosure within the circuit wall takes the place of the forecourt. At Karnak all the parts were repeated several times, and under Amenophis III. (XVIIIth dynasty) a wing was built at a nearly right angle to the main structure. At Luxor, to a complete typical temple were added three aisles of an unfinished hypostyle hall, and an elaborate forecourt, whose axis is inclined to that of the other buildings, owing to a bend of the river at that point. At Abydos a complex sanctuary of many chambers extends southeast at right angles to the general mass, and the first court is without columns. But in all these structures a certain unity of effect is produced by the lofty pylons, the flat roofs diminishing in height over successive portions from the front to the sanctuary, the sloping windowless walls covered with carved and painted pictures, and the dim and massive interiors of the columnar halls.

The size of these temples varies greatly. That of Karnak is over 1200 feet long; Luxor 850; the Ramesseum nearly 600; Abydos and Medinet Abou each 500; while the little temple of Dandour measured less than 50 feet in length.

TEMPLES OF KARNAK. Of these various temples that of **Amen-Ra** is incomparably the largest and most imposing. Its construction extended through the whole duration of the New Empire, of whose architecture it is a splendid *résumé* (Fig. 11). Its extreme length is 1,215 feet, and its greatest width 376 feet. The sanctuary and its accessories, mainly built by Thothmes I. and Thothmes III., cover an area nearly 456×290 feet in extent, and comprise two hypostyle halls and countless smaller halls and chambers. It is preceded by a narrow columnar vestibule and two pylons enclosing a columnar atrium and two obelisks. This is entered from the **Great Hypostyle Hall** (*h* in Fig. 11; Fig. 12), the noblest single work of Egyptian architecture, measuring 340 ×170 feet, and containing 134 columns in sixteen rows, supporting a massive stone roof. The central columns with bell-capitals

are 70 feet high and nearly 12 feet in diameter; the others are smaller and lower, with lotus-bud capitals, supporting a roof lower than that over the three central aisles. A clearstory of stone-grated windows makes up the difference in height between these two roofs. The interior, thus lighted, was splendid with painted reliefs, which helped not only to adorn the hall but to give scale to its massive parts. The whole stupendous creation

FIG. 12.—CENTRAL PORTION OF HYPOSTYLE HALL AT KARNAK.
(From model in Metropolitan Museum, New York.)

was the work of three kings—Rameses I., Seti I., and Rameses II. (XIXth dynasty).

In front of it was the great court, flanked by columns, and still showing the ruins of a central avenue of colossal pillars begun, but never completed, by the Bubastid kings of the XXIId dynasty. One or two smaller structures and the curious lateral wing built by Amenophis III. interrupt the otherwise orderly and symmetrical advance of this plan from the sanctuary to the huge first pylon (last in point of date) erected by the Ptolemies.

The smaller temple of Khonsu, south of that of Amen-Ra, has already been alluded to as a typical example of templar design. Next to Karnak in importance comes the **Temple of Luxor** in its immediate neighborhood. It has two forecourts adorned with

double-aisled colonnades and connected by what seems to be an unfinished hypostyle hall. The **Ramesseum** and the temples of **Medinet Abou** and **Deir-El-Bahari** have already been mentioned (p. 15). At Gournah and Abydos are the next most celebrated temples of this period; the first famous for its rich clustered lotus-columns, the latter for its beautiful sanctuary chambers, dedi-

FIG. 13.—GREAT TEMPLE OF IPSAMBOUL.

cated each to a different deity, and covered with delicate painted reliefs of the time of Seti I.

GROTTO TEMPLES. Two other styles of temple remain to be noticed. The first is the subterranean or grotto temple, of which the two most famous, at Ipsamboul (Abou-simbel), were excavated by Rameses II. They are truly colossal conceptions, reproducing in the native rock the main features of structural temples, the court being represented by the larger of two chambers in the Greater Temple (Fig. 13). Their façades are adorned

with colossal seated figures of the builder; the smaller has also two effigies of Nefert-Ari, his consort. Nothing more striking and boldly impressive is to be met with in Egypt than these singular rock-cut façades. Other rock-cut temples of more modest dimensions are at Addeh, Feraig, Beni-Hassan (the "Speos Artemidos"), Beit-el-Wali, and Silsileh. At Gherf-Hossein, Asseboua, and Derri are temples partly excavated and partly structural.

PERIPTERAL TEMPLES. The last type of temple to be noticed is represented by only three or four structures of moderate size; it is the *peripteral*, in which a small chamber is surrounded by columns, usually mounted on a terrace with vertical walls. They were mere chapels, but are among the most graceful of existing ruins. At Philæ are two structures, one by Nectanebo, the other Ptolemaic, resembling peripteral temples, but without cella-chambers or roofs. They may have been waiting-pavilions for the adjoining temples. That at Elephantine (Amenophis III.) has square piers at the sides, and columns only at the ends. Another by Thothmes II., at Medinet Abou, formed only a part (the sekos?) of a larger plan. At Edfou is another, belonging to the Ptolemaic period.

LATER TEMPLES. After the architectural inaction of the Decadence came a marvellous recrudescence of splendor under the Ptolemies, whose Hellenic origin and sympathies did not lead them into the mistaken effort to impose Greek models upon Egyptian art. The temples erected under their dominion, and later under Roman rule, vied with the grandest works of the Ramessidæ, and surpassed them in the rich elaboration and variety of their architectural details. The temple at Edfou (Figs. 9, 10, 14) is the most perfectly preserved, and conforms most closely to the typical plan; that of Isis, at Philæ, is the most elaborate and ornate. Denderah also possesses a group of admirably preserved temples of the same period. At Esneh, and at Kalabshé and Kardassy or Ghertashi in Nubia are others. In all these

one notes innovations of detail and a striving for effect quite different from the simpler majesty of the preceding age (Fig. 14). One peculiar feature is the use of screen walls built into the front rows of columns of the hypostyle hall. Light was admitted above these walls, which measured about half the height of the columns and were interrupted at the centre by a curious doorway cut through their whole height and without any lintel. Long disused types of capital were revived and others greatly elaborated; and

FIG. 14.—EDFOU. FRONT OF HYPOSTYLE HALL.

the wall-reliefs were arranged in bands and panels with a regularity and symmetry rather Greek than Egyptian.

ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS. With the exception of a few purely utilitarian vaulted structures, all Egyptian architecture was based on the principle of the lintel. Artistic splendor depended upon the use of painted and carved pictures, and the decorative treatment of the very simple supports employed. Piers and columns sustained the roofs of such chambers as were too wide for single lintels, and produced, in halls like those of Karnak, of the Ramesseum, or of Denderah, a stupendous effect by their height, massiveness, number, and colored decoration.

The simplest piers were plain square shafts; others, more elaborate, had lotus stalks and flowers or heads of Hathor carved upon them. The most striking were those against whose front faces were carved colossal figures of Osiris, as at Luxor, Medinet Abou, and Karnak (Fig. 15). The columns, which were seldom over six diameters in height, were treated with greater variety; the shafts, slightly tapering upward, were either round or clustered in section, and usually contracted at the base. The capitals with which they were crowned were usually of one of the five chief types described below. Besides round and clustered shafts, the Middle Empire and a few of the earlier monuments of the New Empire employed polygonal or slightly fluted shafts (see p. 12), as at Beni-Hassan and Karnak; these had a plain square abacus, with sometimes a cushion-like echinus beneath it. A round plinth served as a base for most of the columns.

FIG. 15.—OSIRIS PIER (MEDINET ABOU).

CAPITALS. The five chief types of capital were: *a*, the *campaniform* or inverted bell (central aisles at Karnak, Luxor, the Ramesseum); *b*, the clustered lotus-bud (Beni-Hassan, Karnak, Luxor, Gournah, etc.); *c*, the plain lotus-bud as at Karnak (Great Hall); *d*, the palm-capital, frequent in the later temples; and *e*, the Hathor-headed, in which heads of Hathor adorn the four faces of a cubical mass surmounted by a model of a shrine (Sedinga, Edfou, Denderah, Esneh). These types were richly embellished and varied by the Ptolemaic architects, who gave a clustered or quatrefoil plan to the bell-capital, or adorned its surface with palm leaves. A few other forms are met with as exceptions. They are shown in Fig. 16.

Every part of the column was richly decorated in color. Lotus-leaves or petals swathed the swelling lower part of the shaft, which was elsewhere covered with successive bands of carved pictures and of hieroglyphics. The capital was similarly covered with carved and painted ornament, usually of lotus-flowers or leaves, or alternate stalks of lotus and papyrus.

The lintels were plain and square in section, and often of prodigious size. Where they appeared externally they were crowned



FIG. 16.—TYPES OF COLUMN.

a, Campaniform; b, Clustered Lotus-Column; c, Simple Lotus-Column; d, Palm-Column; e, Hathor-headed Column.

with a simple cavetto cornice, its curved surface covered with colored flutings alternating with *cartouches* of hieroglyphics. Sometimes, especially on the screen walls of the Ptolemaic age, this was surmounted by a cresting of adders or uræi in closely serried rank. No other form of cornice or cresting is met with. Mouldings as a means of architectural effect were singularly lacking in Egyptian architecture. The only moulding known is the clustered torus (*torus* = a convex moulding of semicircular profile), which resembles a bundle of reeds tied together with cords or ribbons. It forms an astragal under the cavetto cornice and runs down the angles of the pylons and walls.

POLYCHROMY AND ORNAMENT. Color was absolutely essential to the decorative scheme. In the vast and dim interiors,

as well as in the blinding glare of the sun, mere sculpture or relief would have been wasted. The application of brilliant color to pictorial forms cut in low relief, or outlined by deep incision with the edges of the figures delicately rounded (*intaglio rilievo*), was the most appropriate treatment possible. The walls and columns were covered with pictures treated in this way, and the ceilings and lintels were embellished with symbolic forms in the same manner. All the ornaments, as distinguished from the paintings, were symbolical, at least in their origin. Over the gateway was the solar disk or globe with wide-spread wings, the symbol of the sun winging its way to the conquest of night; upon the ceiling were sacred vultures, zodiacs, or stars spangled on a blue ground. Externally the temples presented only masses of unbroken wall; but these, as well as the pylons, were covered with huge pictures of a historical character. Only in the tombs do we find painted ornament of a purely conventional sort (Fig. 17). Rosettes, diaper patterns, spirals, and checkers are to be met with in them; but many of these can be traced to symbolic origins.*



FIG. 17.—EGYPTIAN FLORAL ORNAMENT-FORMS.

DOMESTIC ARCHITECTURE. The only remains of palaces are the pavilion of Rameses III. at Medinet Abou, and another at Semneh. The Royal Labyrinth has so completely perished that even its site is uncertain. The Egyptians lived so much out of doors that the house was a less important edifice than in colder climates. Egyptian dwellings were probably in most cases built of wood or crude brick, and their disappearance is thus easily explained. Relief pictures on the monuments indi-

* See Goodyear's *Grammar of the Lotus* for an elaborate and ingenious presentation of the theory of a common lotus-origin for all the conventional forms occurring in Egyptian ornament.

cate the use of wooden framing for the walls, which were probably filled in with crude brick or panels of wood. The larger houses had extensive plans with outer and inner courts surrounded by porticoes and by the various halls and chambers for the family, guests and dependents. The larger halls probably had wooden ceilings supported by wooden posts, which, like the walls of framed wood or of unbaked brick, have long since perished. The architecture was probably simple. Gateways like those of the temples on a smaller scale, the cavetto cornice on the walls, and occasionally carved columns of wood or stone, were the only details pretending to architectural splendor. The ground-plans of many houses in ruined cities, as at Tel-el-Amarna and a nameless city of Amenophis IV., are discernible in the ruins; but the superstructures are wholly wanting.

MONUMENTS: The principal necropolis regions of Egypt are centred about Ghizeh and ancient Memphis for the Old Empire (pyramids and mastabas), Thebes for the Middle Empire (Silsileh, Beni-Hassan), and Thebes (Vale of the Kings, Vale of the Queens) and Abydos for the New Empire.

The Old Empire has also left us the Sphinx, Sphinx temple, and the temple at Meidoum.

The most important temples of the New Empire were those of Karnak (the great temple, the southern or temple of Khonsu, by Rameses III.), of Luxor (Rameses II.), Medinet Abou (great temple of Rameses III., lesser temples of Thothmes II. and III. with peripteral sekos; also Pavilion of Rameses III.); of Abydos (Seti I. and Rameses II.); of Gournah; of Eilithyia (Amenophis III.); of Soleb and Sesebi in Nubia; of Elephantine (peripteral, by Amenophis III.); the tomb temple of Queen Hatasu at Deir-el-Bahari, the Ramesseum (Rameses II.); the Amenopheum (Amenophis III.); hemispeos at Gherf Hossein; two grotto temples at Ipsamboul (Rameses II.).

At Meroë are pyramids of the Ethiopic kings of the Decadence.

Temples of the Ptolemaic period; Philæ, Denderah, Edfou.

Temples of the Roman period; Koum Ombos; Kalabshé, Kardassy and Dandour in Nubia; Esneh.

CHAPTER IV.

CHALDÆAN AND ASSYRIAN ARCHITECTURE.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: As before, Reber. Also, Babelon, *Manual of Oriental Antiquities*. Botta and Flandin, *Monuments de Ninive*. Layard, *Discoveries in Nineveh; Nineveh and its Remains*. Loftus, *Travels and Researches in Chaldæa and Susiana*. Perrot and Chipiez, *History of Art in Chaldæa and Assyria*. Peters, *Nippur*. Place, *Ninive et l'Assyrie*.

SITUATION; HISTORIC PERIODS. The Tigro-Euphrates valley was the seat of a civilization nearly or quite as old as that of the Nile, though inferior in its monumental art. The kingdoms of Chaldæa and Assyria which ruled in this valley, sometimes as rivals and sometimes as subjects one of the other, differed considerably in character and culture. But the scarcity of timber and the lack of good building-stone except in the limestone tablelands and more distant mountains of upper Mesopotamia, the abundance of clay, and the flatness of the country, imposed upon the builders of both nations similar restrictions of conception, form, and material. Both peoples, moreover, were probably, in part at least, of Semitic race.* The Chaldæans had attained a high civilization before 4000 B.C., and had for centuries maintained fixed institutions and practised the arts and sciences when the Assyrians began their career as a nation of conquerors by reducing Chaldæa to subjection.

* This is denied by some recent writers, so far as the Chaldæans are concerned, and is not intended here to apply to the Accadians and Summerians of primitive Chaldæa.

The history of Chaldæo-Assyrian art may be divided into three main periods, as follows:

1. The Early Chaldæan, 4000 to 1250 B.C.
2. The Assyrian, 1250 to 606 B.C.
3. The Babylonian, 606 to 538 B.C.

In 538 the empire fell before the Persians.

General character of monuments. Recent excavations at Nippur (Niffer), the sacred city of Chaldæa, have uncovered ruins older than the Pyramids. Though of slight importance architecturally, they reveal the early knowledge of the arch and the possession of an advanced culture. The poverty of the building materials of this region afforded only the most limited resources for architectural effect. Owing to the flatness of the country and the impracticability of building lofty structures with sun-dried bricks, elevation above the plain could be secured only by erecting buildings of moderate height upon enormous mounds or terraces, built of crude brick and faced with hard brick or stone. This led to the development of the stepped pyramid as the typical form of Chaldæo-Assyrian architecture. Thick walls were necessary both for stability and for protection from the burning heat of that climate. The lack of stone for columns and the difficulty of procuring heavy beams for long spans made broad halls and chambers impossible. The plans of Assyrian palaces look like assemblages of long corridors and small cells (Fig. 18). Neither the wooden post nor the column played any part in this architecture except for window-mullions and subordinate members.* It is probable that the vault was used for roofing many of the halls; the arch was certainly employed for doors and the barrel-vault for the drainage-tunnels under the terraces, made necessary by the heavy rainfall. What these struc-

* See Fergusson, *Palaces of Nineveh and Persepolis*, for an ingenious but unsubstantiated argument for the use of columns in Assyrian palaces.

tures lacked in durability and height was made up in decorative magnificence. The interior walls were wainscoted to a height of eight or nine feet with alabaster slabs covered with those low-relief pictures of hunting scenes, battles, and gods, which now enrich the museums of London, Paris, and other modern cities.



FIG. 18.—PALACE OF SARGON AT KHORSABAD.

Elsewhere painted plaster or more durable enamelled tile in brilliant colors embellished the walls, and, doubtless, rugs and tapestries added their richness to this architectural splendor.

CHALDÆAN ARCHITECTURE. The ruins at Mugheir (the Biblical Ur), dating, perhaps, from 2200 B.C., belong to the two storied terrace or platform of a temple to Sin or Hurki. The wall of sun-dried brick is faced with enamelled tile. The shrine, which was probably small, has wholly disappeared from the sum-

mit of the mound. At Warka (the ancient Erech) are two terrace-walls of palaces, one of which is ornamented with convex flutings and with a species of mosaic in checker patterns and zigzags, formed by terra-cotta cones or spikes driven into the clay, their exposed bases being enamelled in the desired colors. The other shows a system of long, narrow panels, in a style suggesting the influence of Egyptian models through some as yet unknown channel. This panelling became a common feature of the later Assyrian art (see Fig. 19). At Birs-Nimroud are the ruins of a stepped pyramid surmounted by a small shrine. Its seven stages are said to have been originally faced with glazed tile of the seven planetary colors, gold, silver, yellow, red, blue, white, and black. The ruins at Nippur, which comprise temples, altars, and dwellings dating from 4000 B.C., have been alluded to. Babylon, the later capital of Chaldæa, to which the shapeless mounds of Mujelibeh and Kasr seem to have belonged, has left no other recognizable vestige of its ancient magnificence.

ASSYRIAN ARCHITECTURE. Abundant ruins exist of Nineveh, the Assyrian capital, and its adjacent palace-sites. Excavations at Koyunjik, Khorsabad, and Nimroud have laid bare a number of these royal dwellings. Among them are the palace of Assur-nazir-pal (885 B.C.) and two palaces of Shalmaneser II. (850 B.C.) at Nimroud; the great palace of Sargon at Khorsabad (721 B.C.); that of Sennacherib at Koyunjik (704 B.C.); of Esarhaddon at Nimroud (650 B.C.); and of Assur-bani-pal at Koyunjik (660 B.C.). All of these palaces are designed on the same general principle, best shown by the plan (Fig. 18) of the palace of Sargon at Khorsabad, excavated by Botta and Place.

In this palace two large and several smaller courts are surrounded by a complex series of long, narrow halls and small, square chambers. One court probably belonged to the harem, another to the king's apartments, others to dependents and to the service of the palace. The crude brick walls are immensely thick and without windows, the only openings being for doors. The

absence of columns made wide halls impossible, and great size could only be attained in the direction of length. A terraced pyramid supported an altar or shrine to the southwest of the palace; at the west corner was a temple, the substructure of which was crowned by a cavetto cornice showing plainly the influence of Egyptian models. The whole palace stood upon a stupendous platform faced with cut stone, an unaccustomed extravagance in Assyria.

ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS. There is no evidence that the Assyrians ever used columnar supports except in minor or acces-



FIG. 19.—GATE, KHORSABAD.

sory details. There are few halls in any of the ruins too wide to be spanned by good Syrian cedar beams or palm timbers, and these few cases seem to have had vaulted ceilings. So clumsy a feature as the central wall in the great hall of Esarhaddon's palace at Nimroud would never have been resorted to for the support of the ceiling had the Assyrians been familiar with the use of columns. That they understood the arch and vault is proved by their admirable terrace-drains and the fine arched gate in the walls of Khorsabad (Fig. 19), as well as by bas-reliefs representing dwellings with domes of various forms. Moreover, a few vaulted

chambers of moderate size, and fallen fragments of crude brick vaulting of larger span, have been found in several of the Assyrian ruins.

The construction was extremely simple. The heavy clay walls were faced with alabaster, burned brick, or enamelled tiles. The roofs were probably covered with stamped earth, and sometimes paved on top with tiles or slabs of alabaster to form terraces. Light was introduced most probably through windows immediately under the roof and divided by small columns forming mullions, as suggested by certain relief pictures. No other system seems consistent with the windowless walls of the ruins. It is possible that many rooms depended wholly on artificial light or on the scant rays coming through open doors. To this day, in the hot season the population of Mosul takes refuge from the torrid heats of summer in windowless basements lighted only by lamps.

ORNAMENT. The only structural decorations seem to have been the panelling of exterior walls in a manner resembling the Chaldæan terrace-walls, and a form of parapet like a stepped cresting. There were no characteristic mouldings, architraves, capitals, or cornices. Nearly all the ornament was of the sort called *applied*, *i.e.*, added after the completion of the structure itself. Pictures in low relief covered the alabaster revetment. They depicted hunting-scenes, battles, deities, and other mythological subjects, and are interesting to the architect mainly for their occasional representations of buildings and details of construction. Above this wainscot were friezes of enamelled brick ornamented with symbolic forms used as decorative motives; winged bulls, the "sacred tree" and mythological monsters, with rosettes, palmettes, lotus-flowers, and *guilloches* (ornaments of interlacing bands winding about regularly spaced buttons or eyes). These ornaments were also used on the archivolts around the great arches of palace gates. The most singular adornments of these gates were the carved "portal guardians" set into deep jambs—colossal monsters with the bodies of bulls, the wings of

eagles, and human heads of terrible countenance. Of mighty bulk, they were yet minutely wrought in every detail of head-dress, beard, feathers, curly hair, and anatomy.

The purely conventional ornaments mentioned above—the rosette, guilloche, and lotus-flower, and probably also the palmette—were derived from Egyptian originals. They were treated, however, in a quite new spirit and adapted to the special materials and uses of their environment. Thus the form of the palmette, even if derived, as is not unlikely, from the Egyptian lotus-motive, was assimilated to the more familiar palm-forms of Assyria (Fig. 20).

FIG. 20.—ASSYRIAN ORNAMENT.

Assyrian architecture never rivalled the Egyptian in grandeur or constructive power, in seriousness, or the higher artistic qualities. It did, however, produce imposing results with the poorest resources, and in its use of the arch and its development of ornamental forms it furnished prototypes for some of the most characteristic features of later Asiatic art, which profoundly influenced both Greek and Byzantine architecture.

MONUMENTS. The most important Chaldæan and Assyrian monuments of which there are extant remains, have already been enumerated in the text. It is therefore unnecessary to duplicate the list here.

CHAPTER V.

PERSIAN, LYCIAN AND JEWISH ARCHITECTURE.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: As before, Babelon, Reber. Also Bliss, *Excavations at Jerusalem*. Dieulafoy, *L'Art antique de la Perse*, and *L'Acropole de Suse*. Fellows, *Account of Discoveries in Lycia*. Fergusson, *The Temple at Jerusalem*. Flandin et Coste, *Perse ancienne*. Perrot and Chipiez, *History of Art in Persia; History of Art in Phrygia, Lydia, Caria, and Lycia; History of Art in Sardinia and Judæa*. Texier, *L'Arménie et la Perse; L'Asie Mineure*. De Vogüé, *Le Temple de Jérusalem*.

PERSIAN ARCHITECTURE. With the Persians, who under Cyrus (536 B.C.) and Cambyses (525 B.C.) became the masters of the Orient, the Aryan race superseded the Semitic, and assimilated in new combinations the forms it borrowed from the Assyrian civilization. Under the Achæmenidæ (536 to 330 B.C.) palaces were built in Persepolis and Susa of a splendor and majesty impossible in Mesopotamia, and rivalling the marvels in the Nile Valley. The conquering nation of warriors who had overthrown the Egyptians and Assyrians was in turn conquered by the arts of its vanquished foes, and speedily became the most luxurious of all nations. The Persians were not great innovators in art; but inhabiting a land of excellent building resources, they were able to combine the Egyptian system of interior columns with details borrowed from Assyrian art, and suggestions, derived most probably from the general use in Persia and Central Asia, of wooden posts or columns as intermediate supports. Out of these elements they evolved an architecture which has only become fully known to us since the excavations of M. and Mme. Dieulafoy at Susa in 1882.

ELEMENTS OF PERSIAN ARCHITECTURE. The Persians used both crude and baked bricks, the latter far more freely than was practicable in Assyria, owing to the greater abundance of fuel. Walls when built of the weaker material were faced with baked brick enamelled in brilliant colors, or both moulded and enamelled, to form colored pictures in relief. Stone was employed for walls and columns, and, in conjunction with brick, for the jambs and lintels of doors and windows. Architraves and ceiling-beams were of wood. The palaces were erected, as in Assyria, upon broad platforms, partly cut in the rock and partly structural, approached by imposing flights of steps. These palaces were composed of detached buildings, propylæas or gates of honor, vast audience-halls, called *apadanas*, open on one or two sides, and chambers or dwellings partly enclosing or flanking these halls, or grouped in separate buildings. Temples appear to have been of small importance, perhaps owing to habits of out-of-door worship of fire and sun. There are few structural tombs, but there are a number of imposing royal sepulchres cut in the rock at Naksh-i-Roustam.

ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS. The Persians, like the Egyptians, used the column as an internal feature in hypostyle halls of great size, and externally to form porches, and perhaps, also, open kiosks without walls. The great **Hall of Xerxes** at Persepolis covers 100,000 square feet—more than double the area of the Hypostyle Hall at Karnak. But the Persian column was derived from wooden prototypes and used with wooden architraves, permitting a wider spacing than is possible with stone. In the present instance thirty-six columns sufficed for an area nearly equal to that which in the Karnak hall contained one hundred and thirty-four. The shafts being slender and finely fluted instead of painted or carved, the effect produced was totally different from that sought by the Egyptians. The most striking peculiarity of the column was the capital, which was forked (Fig. 21). In one of the two principal types the fork, formed by

the coupled fore-parts of bulls or symbolic monsters, rested directly on the top of the shaft. In the other, two singular members were interposed between the fork and the shaft; the lower, a sort of double bell or bell-and-palm capital, and above it, just beneath the fork, a curious combination of vertical scrolls or volutes, resembling certain ornaments seen in Assyrian furniture The transverse architrave rested in the fork; the longitudinal architrave was supported on the heads of the monsters. A rich moulded base, rather high and in some cases adorned with carved leaves or flutings, supported the columns, which in the Hall of Xerxes were over 66 feet high and 6 feet in diameter. The architraves have perished, but the rock-cut tomb of Darius at Naksh-i-Roustam reproduces in its façade a palace-front, showing a banded architrave with dentils—an obvious imitation of the ends of wooden rafters on a lintel built up of several beams.



FIG. 21.—COLUMN FROM PERSEPOLIS.

These features of the architrave, as well as the fine flutings and moulded bases of the columns, are found in Ionic architecture, and in part, at least, in Lycian tombs. As all these examples date from nearly the same period, the origin of these forms and their mutual relations have not been fully determined. The Persian capitals, however, are unique, and so far as known, without direct prototypes or derivatives. Their constituent elements may have been borrowed from various sources. One can hardly help seeing the Egyptian palm-capital in the lower member of the compound type (Fig. 21).

The doors and windows had banded architraves or trims and cavetto cornices very Egyptian in character. The portals were flanked, as in Assyria, by winged monsters; but these were built up in several courses of stone, not carved from single blocks like their prototypes. Plaster or, as at Susa, enamelled bricks, replaced as a wall-finish the Assyrian alabaster wainscot. These bricks, splendid in color, moulded into relief pictures covering large surfaces, and used more generally on exterior walls than for interior decoration, are the oldest examples of the skill of the Persians in a branch of ceramic art in which they have always excelled down to our own day.

LYCIAN ARCHITECTURE. The architecture of those Asiatic peoples which served as intermediaries between the ancient civilizations of Egypt and Assyria on the one hand and of the Greek on the other need occupy us only a moment in passing. None of them developed a complete and independent style or produced monuments of the first rank. Those chiefly concerned in the transmission of ideas were the Cypriotes, Phœnicians, and Lycians. The part played by other Asiatic nations is too slight to be considered here. From Cyprus the Greeks could have learned little beyond a few elementary notions regarding sculpture and pottery, although it is claimed by some that the volute-form in Ionic architecture was originally derived from patterns on Cypriote pottery and from certain Cypriote steles, where it appears as a modified lotus motive. The Phœnicians were the world's traders from a very early age down to the Persian conquest. They not only distributed through the Mediterranean lands the manufactures of Egypt and Assyria, but also counterfeited them and adopted their forms in decorating their own wares. But they have bequeathed us not a single architectural ruin of importance, either of temple or palace, nor are the few tombs still extant of sufficient artistic interest to deserve even brief mention in a work of this scope.

In Lycia, however, there arose a system of tomb-design which

came near creating a new architectural style, and which doubtless influenced both Persia and the Ionian colonies. The tombs were mostly cut in the rock, though a few are free-standing monolithic monuments, resembling sarcophagi or small shrines mounted on a high base or pedestal.

In all of these tombs we recognize a manifest copying in stone of framed wooden structures. The walls are panelled, or imitate open structures framed of squared timbers. The roofs are often gabled, sometimes in the form of a pointed arch; they generally show a banded architrave, dentils, and a raking cornice, or else an imitation of broadly projecting eaves with small round rafters. There are several with porches of Ionic columns; of these, some are of late date and evidently copied from Asiatic Greek models. Others, and notably one at Telmissus, seem to be examples of a primitive Ionic, and may indeed have been early steps in the development of that splendid style which the Ionic Greeks, both in Asia Minor and in Attica, carried to such perfection.

JEWISH ARCHITECTURE. The Hebrews borrowed from the art of every people with whom they had relations, so that we encounter in the few extant remains of their architecture Egyptian, Assyrian, Phœnician, Greek, Roman, and Syro-Byzantine features, but nothing like an independent national style. Among the most interesting of these remains are tombs of various periods, principally occurring in the valleys near Jerusalem, and erroneously ascribed by popular tradition to the judges, prophets, and kings of Israel. Some of them are structural, some cut in the rock; the former (tomb of Absalom, of Zechariah) decorated with Doric and Ionic engaged orders, were once supposed to be primitive types of these orders and of great antiquity. They are now recognized to be debased imitations of late Greek work of the third or second century B.C. They have Egyptian cavetto cornices and pyramidal roofs, like many Asiatic tombs. The openings of the rock-cut tombs have frames or pediments carved with rich surface ornament showing a similar mixture of types—Ro-

man triglyphs and garlands, Syrian-Greek acanthus leaves, conventional foliage of Byzantine character, and naturalistic carvings of grapes and local plant life. The carved arches of two of the ancient city gates (one the so-called Golden Gate) in Jerusalem display rich acanthus foliage somewhat like that of the tombs, but more vigorous and artistic. If of the time of Herod or even of Constantine, as claimed by some, they would indicate that Greek artists in Syria created the prototypes of Byzantine ornament. They are more probably, however, Byzantine restorations of the 6th century A.D.

The one great achievement of Jewish architecture was the national **Temple of Jehovah,** represented by three successive edifices on Mount Moriah, the site of the present so-called "Mosque of Omar." The first, built by Solomon (1012 B.C.) appears from the Biblical description* to have combined Egyptian conceptions (successive courts, lofty entrance-pylons, the Sanctuary and the sekos or "Holy of Holies") with Phœnician and Assyrian details and workmanship (cedar wood-work, empaistic decoration or overlaying with *repoussé* metal work, the isolated brazen columns Jachin and Boaz). The whole stood on a mighty platform built up with stupendous masonry and vaulted chambers from the valley surrounding the rock on three sides. This precinct was nearly doubled in size by Herod (18 B.C.) who extended it southward by a terrace-wall of still more colossal masonry. Some of the stones are twenty-two feet long; one reaches the prodigious length of forty feet. The "Wall of Lamentations" is a part of this terrace, upon which stood the Temple on a raised platform. As rebuilt by Herod, the Temple reproduced in part the antique design, and retained the porch of Solomon along the east side; but the whole was superbly reconstructed in white marble with abundance of gilding. Defended by the Castle of Antonia on the northwest, and embellished with a new and imposing triple colonnade on the south, the whole edifice, a conglomerate of Egyptian,

* 1 Kings vi.-vii.; 2 Chronicles iii.-iv.

Assyrian, and Roman conceptions and forms, was one of the most singular and yet magnificent creations of ancient art.

The temple of Zerubbabel (515 B.C.), intermediate between those above described, was probably less a re-edification of the first, than a new design. While based on the scheme of the first temple, it appears to have followed more closely the pattern described in the vision of Ezekiel (chapters xl.-xlii.). It was far inferior to its predecessor in splendor and costliness. No vestiges of it remain.

MONUMENTS. PERSIAN: at Murghab, the tomb of Cyrus, known as Gabré-Madré-Soleiman—a gabled structure on a seven-stepped pyramidal basement (525 B.C.). At Persepolis the palace of Darius (521 B.C.); the Propylæa of Xerxes, his palace and his harem (?) or throne-hall (480 B.C.), one of the most imposing architectural groups in the world. At various points, tower-like tombs, supposed erroneously by Fergusson to have been fire altars. At Naksh-i-Roustam, the tomb of Darius, cut in the rock. Other tombs near by at Persepolis proper and at Pasargadæ. At the latter place remains of the palace of Cyrus. At Susa the palace of Xerxes and Artaxerxes (480-405 B.C.).

LYCIAN: the principal Lycian monuments are found in Myra, Antiphellus, and Telmissus. Some of the monolithic tombs have been removed to the British and other European museums.

JEWISH: the temples have been mentioned above. The palace of Solomon. The rock-cut monolithic tomb of Siloam. So-called tombs of Absalom and Zechariah, structural; probably of Herod's time or later. Rock-cut tombs of the Kings; of the Prophets, etc. City gates (Herodian or early Christian period).

CHAPTER VI.

GREEK ARCHITECTURE.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: As before, Reber. Also Anderson and Spiers, *Architecture of Greece and Rome.* Baumeister, *Denkmäler der klassischen Alterthums.* Bötticher, *Tektonik der Hellenen.* Chipiez, *Histoire critique des ordres grecs.* Curtius, Adler and Treu, *Die Ausgrabungen zu Olympia.* Durm, *Antike Baukunst* (in *Handbuch d. Arch*). Frazer, *Pausanias' Description of Greece.* Hitorff, *L'architecture polychrome chez les Grecs.* Krell, *Geschichte des dorischen Stils.* Marquand, *Greek Architecture.* Michaelis, *Der Parthenon.* Penrose, *An Investigation, etc., of Athenian Architecture.* Perrot and Chipiez, *History of Art in Primitive Greece; La Grèce de l'Épopée; La Grèce archaique.* Schliemann, *Mycenæ; Ilios.* Schuchardt, *Schliemann's Excavations.* Stuart and Revett, *Antiquities of Athens.* Tarbell, *History of Greek Art.* Texier, *L'Asie Mineure.* Wilkins, *Antiquities of Magna Græcia.*

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS. Greek art marks the beginning of European civilization. The Hellenic race gathered up influences and suggestions from both Asia and Africa and fused them with others, whose sources are unknown, into an art intensely national and original, which was to influence the arts of many races and nations long centuries after the decay of the Hellenic states. The Greek mind, compared with the Egyptian or Assyrian, was more highly intellectual, more logical, more symmetrical, and above all more inquiring and analytic. Living nowhere remote from the sea, the Greeks became sailors, merchants, and colonizers. The Ionian kinsmen of the European Greeks, speaking a dialect of the same language, populated the coasts of Asia Minor and many of the islands, so that through them the Greeks were open to the influences of the Assyrian,

Phœnician, Persian, and Lycian civilizations. In Cyprus they encountered Egyptian influences, and finally, under Psammetichus, they established in Egypt itself the Greek city of Naukratis. They were thus by geographical situation, by character, and by circumstances, peculiarly fitted to receive, develop, and transmit the mingled influences of the East and the South.

PREHISTORIC MONUMENTS. Authentic Greek history begins with the first Olympiad, 776 B.C. The history of the lay period of primitive and developing culture preceding that date was wholly unknown, otherwise than through legends and the Homeric poems, until the researches of Schliemann and his successors, and in still more recent years the Cretan discoveries of Evans, uncovered the remains of the prehistoric cities of Troy, in Asia Minor, Mycenæ and Tiryns, in Greece, and of Cnossus in Crete, and revealed the existence of an ancient culture extending back over 2000 years B.C., already in its decline at the time of the Homeric wars. This civilization has been called the Mycenæan, but is now more properly termed the Aegean or Mediterranean culture. It belongs to the bronze age, and reached its culmination during the time of the XIX and XX dynasties in Egypt, about 1500–1300 B.C. Its long decline began with the introduction of iron into the Mediterranean countries, and it seems to have been overthrown or submerged by the Dorian migration of the end of the 12th century B.C. It borrowed much from Egypt, with which the primitive Greeks of the Aegean countries and islands main-

FIG. 22.—LION GATE AT MYCENÆ.

tained an active commerce; but it is believed to have been largely an independent civilization, for it displays a purely Western vivacity and originality. The swords, gold jewels, carved gems ("island stones"), bronzes and pottery, as well as the architectural remains, display these qualities in a marked degree.

"Prehistoric" Architecture. A remarkable feature of the architecture of the Mycenæan or Aegean age is the complete absence of temples. Fortifications, houses, palaces, and tombs make up the ruins thus far discovered. The primitive house consisted of a hall or *megaron* with four columns about the central hearth (whence, no doubt, the atrium and peristyle of Roman houses, through their Greek intermediary prototypes) and a porch or *aithousa*, with or without columns *in antis*, opening directly into the *megaron*, or indirectly through an ante-room called the *prodomos*. Here we have the prototypes of the Greek temple *in antis*, with its *naos* having interior columns, whether roofed over or hypæthral (see pp. 55, 56). The use of timber for certain of the structural details led in time to many of the forms later developed in stone in the entablature of the Doric order. But it is hard to discover, as Dörpfeld would have it, in the slender Mycenæan columns with their inverted taper, the prototype of the massive Doric column with its upward taper. The Mycenæan column was apparently derived from wooden models, the sturdy Doric column from stone or rubble piers (see p. 51).

The *gynecæum*, or women's apartments, the men's apartments, and the bath were in these ancient palaces grouped in varying relations about the *megaron:* their plan, purpose, and arrangement are clearly revealed in the ruins of Tiryns, where they are more complete and perfect than either at Troy or Mycenæ.*

FORTIFICATIONS AND WALLS. The most imposing remains of Aegean architecture are the acropolis fortifications and city walls of **Mycenæ** and **Tiryns.** At the latter place the walls of

* A typical Mycenæan house was uncovered at Niffer in Chaldæa by the expedition of the University of Pennsylvania.

huge stones, piled without cement, contain passages covered by stones successively corbelled out until they meet overhead. At Mycenæ the city wall is pierced by the remarkable **Lion Gate** (Fig. 22), consisting of two jambs and a huge lintel, over which the weight is relieved by a triangular opening. This is filled with a sculptured group, now much defaced, representing two rampant lions flanking a downward-tapering column. This symbolic group has relations with Hittite and Phrygian sculptures, and with the symbolism of the worship of Rhea Cybele. The masonry of this wall is carefully dressed but not regularly coursed. Other primitive walls and gates showing openings and embryonic arches of various forms, are found widely scattered, at Samos and Delos, at Phigaleia, Thoricus, Argos and many other points. The very earliest are hardly more than random piles of rough stone. Those which may fairly claim notice for their artistic masonry are of a later date and of three kinds: the coursed, the polygonal, and the uncoursed or Cyclopean, so called from the tradition that they were built by the Cyclopes. The polygonal walls were composed of large, irregular polygonal blocks carefully fitted together and dressed to a fairly smooth face, as at Mycenæ (Fig. 23). The Cyclopean masonry, of huge irregular stones with smaller pieces to wedge the interstices, is illustrated by the walls of Tiryns. All three kinds were used contemporaneously, though in the course of time the regular coursed masonry finally superseded the polygonal.

FIG. 23.—POLYGONAL MASONRY.

THOLOS OF ATREUS. All these structures present, however, only the rudiments of architectural art. The so-called **Tholos** (or Treasury) **of Atreus,** at Mycenæ, on the other hand, shows the germs of truly artistic design (Fig. 24). It is in reality a tomb, and is one of a large class of prehistoric tombs found in almost

every part of the globe, consisting of a circular stone-walled and stone-roofed chamber buried under a tumulus of earth. This one is a beehive-shaped construction of horizontal courses of masonry, with a stone-walled passage, the *dromos*, leading to the entrance door. Though internally of domical form, its construction with horizontal beds in the masonry proves that the idea of the true dome with the beds of each course pitched at an angle always normal to the curve of the vault, was not yet grasped. A small sepulchral chamber opens from the great one, by a door with the customary relieving triangle over it.



FIG. 24.—THOLOS OF ATREUS. PLAN AND SECTION.

Traces of a metal lining have been found on the inner surface of the dome and on the jambs of the entrance-door. This entrance is the most artistic and elaborate part of the edifice (Fig. 25). The main opening is enclosed in a three-banded frame, and was once flanked by half columns which tapered downward as in the sculptured column over the Lion Gate. Shafts, bases, and capitals were covered with zig-zag bands or chevrons of fine spirals. This well-studied decoration, the banded jambs, and the curiously inverted columns (of which several other examples



FIG. 25.—THOLOS OF ATREUS. DOORWAY.

exist in or near Mycenæ), all point to a fairly developed art, derived partly from Egyptian and partly from local or possibly Asiatic sources. That Egyptian influences had affected this early art is further proved by a fragment of carved and painted ornament on an alabaster ceiling in Orchomenos, imitating with remarkable closeness certain ceiling decorations in Egyptian tombs. This fragment was found in a "beehive" tomb analogous to that of Mycenæ.*

Few other details of the Aegean architecture have been preserved. Certain alabaster fragments display a peculiar ornament like a diglyph flanked by half-rosettes encircled by a guilloche. The columns had well-defined bases and capitals, but show little if any analogy to the columns of later Greek art. Except for the ceiling in the Orchomenos tomb there is little evidence of influences from Egyptian architecture. This is the more notable as the chief buildings of Mycenæ and Tiryns belong to the 13th and 12th centuries B.C., the period of Egyptian greatness under the second Theban monarchy, and it argues for the independent development of this art.

Until further investigations of the remarkable Cretan art revealed in the ruins of the **Palace of Minos** at Cnossus shall have made known something more of the architectural forms and decorative art of that early culture than we now know, it will be impossible to determine how far, if at all, the architecture of Mycenæ, Tiryns and Troy was dependent upon or inspired from that of Crete.

With the Dorian migration (*cir.* 1100 B.C.) this chapter of Greek architecture comes to its close. The artistic revival of the eighth century under the Ionian Greeks in Rhodes and Melos

* The columns and other fragments of the doorway of the Tholos of Atreus, long lost in England, were in 1904 recovered and set up in the British Museum, under the direction of R. Phené Spiers, F.R.I.B.A., to whom I am indebted for the restoration reproduced in Figure 25.

produced no architecture that has come down to us. There is a nearly complete sundering between the Mycenæan architecture and the historic architecture of Greece. The end of the one and beginnings of the other are alike shrouded in uncertainty.

HISTORIC MONUMENTS: THE ORDERS. It was the Dorians and Ionians who developed the architecture of classic Greece. This fact is perpetuated in the traditional names, Doric and Ionic, given to the two systems of columnar design which formed the most striking feature of that architecture. While in Egypt the column was used almost exclusively as an internal support and decoration, in Greece it was chiefly employed to produce an imposing exterior effect. It was the most important element in the temple architecture of the Greeks, and an almost indispensable adornment of their gateways, public squares, and temple enclosures. To the column the two races named above gave each a special and radically distinct development, and it was not until the Periclean age that the two forms came to be used in conjunction, even by the mixed Doric-Ionic people of Attica. Each of the two types had its own special shaft, capital, entablature, mouldings, and ornaments, although considerable variation was allowed in the proportions and minor details. The general type, however, remained substantially unchanged from first to last. The earliest examples known to us of either order show it complete in all its parts; its later development being restricted to the refining and perfecting of its proportions and details. The probable origin of these orders will be separately considered later on.

THE DORIC. The column of the Doric order (Figs. 26, 27) consists of a tapering shaft rising directly from the stylobate or platform and surmounted by a capital of great simplicity and beauty The shaft is fluted with sixteen to twenty shallow channellings of segmental or elliptical section, meeting in sharp edges or *arrises*. The capital is made up of a circular cushion or *echinus* adorned with fine grooves called *annulæ*, and a plain square *abacus* or cap. Upon this rests a plain architrave or

epistyle, with a narrow fillet, the *tænia*, running along its upper edge. The frieze above it is divided into square panels, called the *metopes*, separated by vertical *triglyphs* having each two vertical grooves and chamfered edges. There is a triglyph over each column and one over each intercolumniation, or two in rare instances where the columns are widely spaced. The cornice consists of a broadly projecting *corona* resting on a *bed-mould* of one or two simple mouldings. Its under surface, called the *soffit*, is adorned with *mutules*, square, flat projections having each eighteen *guttæ* depending from its under side. Two or three small mouldings run along the upper edge of the corona, which has in addition, over each slope of the gable, a gutter-moulding or *cymatium*. The cornices along the horizontal edges of the roof have instead of the cymatium a row of *antefixæ*, ornaments of terra-cotta or marble, placed opposite the foot of each tile-ridge of the roofing. The enclosed triangular field of the gable, called the *tympanum*, was in the larger monuments adorned with sculptured groups resting on the shelf formed by the horizontal cornice below. Carved ornaments called *acroteria* commonly embellished the three angles of the gable or pediment.



FIG. 26.—GREEK DORIC ORDER.

*a, Crepidoma, or Stylobate; b, Column; c, Architrave; d, Tænia; e, Frieze; f, Horizontal cornice; g, Raking cornice; h, Tympanum of pediment; k, Metope.**

POLYCHROMY. It has been fully proved, after a century of debate, that all this elaborate system of parts, severe and dignified

* In this and other cuts of the orders, only the upper and lower parts of the shaft are shown, the intervening and greater part of the shaft being omitted, to save space.

in their simplicity of form, received a rich decoration of color. While the precise shades and tones employed cannot be predicated with certainty, it is well established that the triglyphs were painted blue and the metopes red, and that all the mouldings were decorated with leaf-ornaments, "eggs-and-darts," and frets, in red, green, blue, and gold. The walls and columns were also colored, probably with pale tints of yellow or buff, to reduce the glare of the fresh marble or the whiteness of the fine stucco with which the surfaces of masonry of coarser stone were primed. In the clear Greek atmosphere and outlined against the brilliant sky, the Greek temple must have presented an aspect of rich, sparkling gayety.

ORIGIN OF THE ORDER. It is generally believed that the details of the Doric frieze and cornice were reminiscences of a primitive wood construction, going back perhaps to Mycenæan prototypes. The triglyph suggests the chamfered ends of cross-beams made up of three planks each; the mutules, the sheathing of the eaves; and the guttæ, the heads of the spikes or trenails by which the sheathing was secured. It is known that in early astylar temples the metopes were left open like the spaces between the ends of ceiling-rafters. In the earlier peripteral temples, as at Selinus, the triglyph-frieze is retained around the cella-wall under the ceiling of the colonnade, where it has no functional significance, as a survival from times antedating the adoption of the colonnade, when the tradition of a wooden

FIG. 27.—DORIC ORDER OF THE PARTHENON.

roof-construction showing externally had not yet been forgotten.

A similar wooden origin for the Doric column has been advocated by some, who point to the assertion of Pausanias that in the Doric Heraion at Olympia the original wooden columns had with one exception been replaced by stone columns as fast as they decayed. (See page 63.) This, however, only proves that wooden columns were sometimes used in early buildings, not that the Doric column was derived from them. Dörpfeld, a high authority, would seek its origin in the Mycenæan column (see *ante*, p. 44). Others would derive it from the Egyptian columns of Beni Hassan (p. 12), which it certainly resembles. But it is not likely that the Greeks, in selecting models for imitation, would have passed over the splendors of Karnak and Luxor to copy these inconspicuous tombs perched high up on the cliffs of the Nile. It would seem that they invented this form independently, developing it in buildings which have perished; unless, indeed, they brought the idea with them from their primitive Aryan home in Asia.

THE IONIC ORDER was characterized by greater slenderness of proportion and elegance of detail than the Doric, and depended more on carving than on color for the decoration of its members (Fig. 28). It was adopted in the fifth century B.C. by the people of Attica, and used both for civic and religious buildings, sometimes alone and sometimes in conjunction with the Doric. The column was from eight to ten diameters in height, against four and one-third to seven for the Doric. It stood on a base which was usually composed of two tori (see p. 25 for definition) separated by a *scotia* (a concave moulding of semicircular or semielliptical profile), and was sometimes provided also with a square flat base-block, the *plinth*. There was much variety in the proportions and details of these mouldings, which were often enriched by flutings or carved guilloches. The tall shaft bore twenty-four deep narrow flutings separated by narrow fillets.

The capital was the most peculiar feature of the order. It consisted of a bead or *astragal* and echinus, over which was a horizontal band ending on either side in a scroll or volute, the sides of which presented the aspect shown in Fig. 29. A thin moulded abacus was interposed between this member and the architrave.

The Ionic capital was marked by two awkward features which all its richness could not conceal. One was the protrusion of the echinus beyond the face of the band above it, the other was the disparity between the side and front views of the capital, especially noticeable at the corners of a colonnade. To obviate this, various contrivances were tried, none wholly successful. Ordinarily the two adjacent exterior sides of the corner capital were treated alike, the scrolls at their meeting being bent out at an angle of 45°, while the two inner faces simply intersected, cutting each other in halves.



FIG. 28.—GREEK IONIC ORDER. (MILETUS.)

The entablature comprised an architrave of two or three flat bands crowned by fine mouldings; an uninterrupted frieze, frequently sculptured in relief; and a simple cornice of great beauty. In addition to the ordinary bed-mouldings there was in most examples a row of narrow blocks or *dentils* under the corona, which was itself crowned by a high cymatium of extremely graceful profile, carved with the rich "honeysuckle" (*anthemion*) ornament. All the mouldings were carved with the "egg-and-dart," heart-leaf and anthemion ornaments, so designed as to recall by their outline the profile of the moulding itself. The details of this order were treated with much more freedom and variety than those of the Doric. The pediments of Ionic buildings were rarely or never adorned with groups of sculpture. The volutes and

echinus of the capital, the fluting of the shaft, the use of a moulded circular base, and in the cornice the high corona and cymatium, these were constant elements in every Ionic order, but all other details varied widely in the different examples.

ORIGIN OF THE IONIC ORDER. The origin of the Ionic order has given rise to almost as much controversy as that of the Doric. Its different elements were apparently derived from various sources. The Lycian tombs may have contributed the denticular cornice and perhaps also the general form of the column and capital. The banded architrave is found in Mycenæ as well as in Lycian and Persian work, and is plainly derived from superposed wooden lintels.



FIG. 29.—SIDE VIEW OF IONIC CAPITAL.

Various archaic capitals found in Ionic Asia Minor and Greece display separately the component elements of the Ionic capital. The volutes appear to have originated primarily in branching spirals springing from the shaft, as in many Assyrian and Cypriote finials and stele-heads; their union by a horizontal band, forming a sort of abacus, was a late modification. The volute or scroll itself as an independent decorative motive may have originated in successive variations of Egyptian lotus-patterns.* But the combination of these diverse elements and their development into the final form of the order was the work of the Ionian Greeks, and it was in the Ionian provinces of Asia Minor that the most splendid examples of its use are to be found (Halicarnassus, Miletus, Priene, Ephesus), while the most graceful and perfect are those of Doric-Ionic Attica.

THE CORINTHIAN ORDER. This was a late outgrowth of the Ionic rather than a new order, and up to the time of the Roman conquest was only used for monuments of small size (see Fig. 38).

* As contended by W. H. Goodyear in his *Grammar of the Lotus.*

Its entablature in pure Greek examples was identical with the Ionic; the shaft and base were only slightly changed in proportion and detail. The capital, however, was a new departure, consisting in the best examples of a high bell-shaped core surrounded by one or two rows of acanthus leaves, above which were pairs of branching scrolls meeting at the corners in spiral volutes. These served to support the angles of a moulded abacus with concave sides (Fig. 30). One example, from the Tower of the Winds (the clepsydra of Andronicus Cyrrhestes) at Athens, has only smooth pointed palm-leaves and no scrolls above a single row of acanthus leaves. Indeed, the variety and disparity among the different examples prove that we have here only the first steps toward the evolution of an independent order, which it was reserved for the Romans to fully develop.



FIG. 30.—GREEK CORINTHIAN ORDER.
(From the monument of Lysicrates.)

GREEK TEMPLES: THE TYPE. With the orders as their chief decorative element the Greeks built up a splendid architecture of religious and secular monuments. Their noblest works were temples, which they designed with the utmost simplicity of general scheme, but carried out with a mastery of proportion and detail which has never been surpassed. Of moderate size in most cases, they were intended primarily to enshrine the simulacrum of the deity, and not, like Christian churches, to accommodate great throngs of worshippers. Nor were they, on the other hand, sanctuaries designed, like those of Egypt, to exclude all but a privi-

leged few from secret rites performed only by the priests and king. The statue of the deity was enshrined in a chamber, the *naos* (see plan, Fig. 31), often of considerable size, and accessible to the public through a columnar porch, the *pronaos*. A smaller chamber, the *opisthodomus*, was sometimes added in the rear of the main sanctuary, to serve as a treasury or depository for votive offerings. Together these formed a windowless structure called the *cella*, beyond which was the rear porch, the *posticum* or *epinaos*. This whole structure was in the larger temples surrounded by a colonnade, the *peristyle*, which formed the most splendid feature of Greek architecture. The external aisle on either side of the cella was called the *pteroma*. A single gabled roof covered the entire building.



FIG. 31.—TYPES OF GREEK TEMPLE PLANS.

a, *In Antis*; *b*, *Prostyle*; *c*, *Amphiprostyle*; *d*, *Peripterăl* (*The Parthenon*); *N*, *Naos*; *O*, *Opisthodomus*;* *S*, *Statue*.

The Greek colonnade was thus an exterior feature, surrounding the solid cella-wall instead of being enclosed by it as in Egypt. The temple was a public, not a royal monument; and its builders aimed, not as in Egypt at size and overwhelming sombre majesty, but rather at sunny beauty and the highest perfection of proportion, execution, and detail (Fig. 34).

There were of course many variations of the general type just described. Each of these has received a special name, which is given in the following list with explanations and is illustrated in Fig. 31.

* There is much uncertainty in the use of this term. By many writers it is applied to the *posticum* or rear portico. In the Parthenon itself the chamber marked *o* was specially designated as the Parthenon, and the naos was called the Hecatompedon or hundred-foot hall.

In antis; with a porch having two or more columns enclosed between the projecting side-walls of the cella.*

Prostylar (or prostyle); with a columnar porch in front and no peristyle.

Amphiprostylar (or -style); with columnar porches at both ends but no peristyle.†

Peripteral; surrounded by columns.‡

Pseudoperipteral; with false or engaged columns built into the walls of the cella, leaving no pteroma.§

Dipteral; with double lateral ranges of columns (see Fig. 39).

Pseudodipteral, with a single row of columns on each side, whose distance from the wall is equal to two intercolumniations of the front.‖

Tetrastyle, hexastyle, octastyle, decastyle, etc.; with four, six, eight, or ten columns in the end rows.

The Greeks also occasionally erected circular temples or shrines, though the majority of these belong to the Macedonian age: *e. g.*, the Philippeion at Olympia.

CONSTRUCTION. All the temples known to us are of stone, though it is evident from allusions in the ancient writers that wood was sometimes used in early times. (See p. 63.) The finest temples, especially those of Attica, Olympia, and Asia Minor, were of marble. In Magna Græcia, at Assos, and in other places where marble was wanting, limestone, sandstone, or lava was employed and finished with a thin, fine stucco. The roof was almost invariably of wood and gabled, forming at the ends pediments decorated in most cases with sculpture. The disappearance of these inflammable and perishable roofs has given rise to endless speculations as to the lighting of the cellas, which in

* Themis Temple at Rhamnus.
† Temple of Nike Apteros, Athens.
‡ All the larger temples, also the Mausoleum.
§ Temple of Zeus at Agrigentum.
‖ Two of the temples at Selinus.

all known ruins, except one at Agrigentum, are destitute of windows. It has been conjectured that light was admitted through openings in the roof, and even that the central part of the cella was wholly open to the sky. Such an arrangement is termed *hypæthral*, from an expression used in a description by Vitruvius;* but this description corresponds to no known structure, and the weight of opinion now inclines against the use of the hypæthral opening, except possibly in one or two of the largest temples, in which a part of the cella in front of the statue may have been thus left open. But even this partial *hypæthros* is not substantiated by direct evidence. It hardly seems probable that the magnificent chryselephantine statues of such temples were ever thus left exposed to the extremes of the climate, which are often severe even in Greece. In the model of the Parthenon designed by Ch. Chipiez for the Metropolitan Museum in New York, a small clerestory opening through the roof admits a moderate amount of light to the cella; but this ingenious device rests on no positive evidence (see Frontispiece). It seems on the whole most probable that the cella was lighted entirely by artificial illumination; but the controversy in its present state is and must be wholly speculative.

The wooden roof was covered with tiles of terra-cotta or marble. It was probably ceiled and panelled on the under side, and richly decorated with color and gold. The pteroma had under the exterior roof a ceiling of stone or marble, deeply panelled between transverse architraves.

The naos and opisthodomus being in the larger temples too wide to be spanned by single beams, were furnished with interior columns to afford intermediate support. To avoid the extremes of too great massiveness and excessive slenderness in these columns, they were built in two stages, and advantage was taken of this arrangement, in some cases, at least, to introduce lateral galleries into the naos.

* Lib III., Cap. I.

SCULPTURE AND CARVING. All the architectural membering was treated with the greatest refinement of design and execution, and the aid of sculpture, both in relief and in the round, was invoked to give splendor and significance to the monument. The statue of the deity was the focus of internal interest, while externally, groups of statues representing the Olympian deities or the mythical exploits of gods, demigods, and heroes, adorned the gables. Relief carvings in the friezes and metopes commemorated the favorite national myths. In these sculptures we have the finest known adaptations of pure sculpture—*i.e.*, sculpture treated as such and complete in itself—to an architectural framework. The noblest examples of this decorative sculpture are those of the Parthenon, consisting of figures in the full round from the pediments, groups in high relief from the metopes, and the beautiful frieze of the Panathenaic procession from the cella-wall under the pteroma ceiling. The greater part of these splendid works are now in the British Museum, whither they were removed by Lord Elgin in 1801. From Olympia, Aegina, and Phigaleia, other master-works of the same kind have been transferred to the museums of Europe. In the Doric style there was little carving

FIG. 32.—CARVED ANTHEMION ORNAMENT. ATHENS.

other than the sculpture, the ornament being mainly polychromatic. Greek Ionic and Corinthian monuments, however, as well as minor works such as steles, altars, etc., were richly adorned with carved mouldings and friezes, festoons, acroteria, and other embellishments executed with the chisel. The anthemion ornament, a form related to the Egyptian lotus and Assyrian palmette, most frequently figures in these. It was made into designs of wonderful vigor and beauty (Fig. 32).

DETAIL AND EXECUTION. In the handling and cutting of stone the Greeks displayed a surpassing skill and delicacy. While ordinarily they were content to use stones of moderate size, they never hesitated at any dimension necessary for proper effect or solid construction. The lower drums of the Parthenon peristyle are 6 feet 6½ inches in diameter, and 2 feet 10 inches high, cut from single blocks of Pentelic marble. The architraves of the Propylæa at Athens are each made up of two lintels placed side by side, the longest 17 feet 7 inches long, 3 feet 10 inches high, and 2 feet 4 inches thick. In the colossal temples of Asia Minor, where the taste for the vast and grandiose was more pronounced, blocks of much greater size were used. These enormous stones were cut and fitted with the most scrupulous exactness. The walls of all important structures were built in regular courses throughout, every stone carefully bedded with extremely close joints. The masonry was usually laid up without cement and clamped with metal; there is no filling in with rubble and concrete between mere facings of cut stone, as in most modern work. When the only available stone was of coarse texture it was finished with a coating of fine stucco, in which sharp edges and minute detail could be worked.

The details were, in the best period, executed with the most extraordinary refinement and care. The profiles of capitals and mouldings, the carved ornament, the arrises of the flutings, were cut with marvellous precision and delicacy. It has been rightly said that the Greeks "built like Titans and finished like jew-

ellers." But this perfect finish was never petty nor wasted on unworthy or vulgar design. The just relation of scale between the building and all its parts was admirably maintained; the ornament was distributed with rare judgment, and the vigor of its design saved it from all appearance of triviality.

The sensitive taste of the Greeks led them into other refinements than those of mere mechanical perfection. In the Parthenon especially, but also in lesser degree in other temples, the seemingly straight lines of the building were all slightly curved, and the vertical faces inclined. This was done to correct the monotony and stiffness of absolutely straight lines and right angles, and certain optical illusions which their acute observation had detected. The long horizontal lines of the stylobate and cornice were made convex upward; a similar convexity in the horizontal corona of the pediment counteracted the seeming concavity otherwise resulting from its meeting with the multiplied inclined lines of the raking cornice. The columns were almost imperceptibly inclined toward the cella, and the corner intercolumniations made a trifle narrower than the rest; while the vertical lines of the arrises of the flutings were made convex outward with a curve of the utmost beauty and delicacy. By these and other like refinements there was imparted to the monument an elasticity and vigor of aspect, an elusive and surprising beauty impossible to describe and not to be explained by the mere composition and general proportions, yet manifest to every cultivated eye.*

* These refinements, first noticed by Allason in 1814, and later confirmed by Cockerell and Haller as to the columns, were published to the world in 1838 by Hoffer, verified by Penrose in 1846, and further developed by the investigations of Ziller and later observers.

CHAPTER VII.

GREEK ARCHITECTURE.—*Continued.*

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: Same as for Chapter VI. Also, Bacon and Clarke, *Investigations at Assos.* Cavvadias, *Fouilles d'Épidaure.* D'Ooge, *The Acropolis at Athens.* Espouy, *Fragments d'architecture antique.* Harrison and Verrall, *Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens.* Hitorff et Zanth, *Recueil des Monuments de Ségeste et Sélinonte; Architecture antique de la Sicile.* Magne, *Le Parthénon.* Middleton, *Plans and Drawings of Athenian Buildings.* Newton and Pullan, *A History of Discoveries at Halicarnassus, etc.* Koldewey and Puchstein, *Die griechischen Tempel in Unter-italien und Sicilien.* Waldstein, *The Argive Heræum.*

HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT. The history of Greek architecture, subsequent to the Heroic or Primitive Age, may be divided into periods as follows:

The ARCHAIC; from 650 to 500 B.C.

The TRANSITIONAL; from 500 to 460 B.C., or to the revival of prosperity after the Persian wars.

The PERICLEAN; from 460 to 400 B.C.

The FLORID or ALEXANDRIAN; from 400 to 300 B.C.

The DECADENT; 300 to 100 B.C.

The ROMAN; 100 B.C. to 200 A.D.

These dates are, of course, arbitrary; the development of styles is a continuous and gradual process; but divisions like the above are convenient aids in following this development through its various phases.

ARCHAIC PERIOD. The archaic period is characterized by the exclusive use of the Doric order, which appears in the earliest

monuments complete in all its parts, but heavy in its proportions and coarse in its execution. The oldest known temples of this period are the **Apollo Temple** at Corinth (650 B.C.?), and the **Northern Temple** on the acropolis at **Selinus** in Sicily (cir. 610–590 B.C.). They are both of a coarse limestone covered with stucco. The columns are low and massive ($4\frac{1}{3}$ to $4\frac{2}{3}$ diameters in height), widely spaced, and carry a very high entablature. The triglyphs still appear around the cella wall under the pteroma ceiling, an illogical detail destined to disappear in later buildings. Other temples at Selinus date from the middle or latter part of the sixth century; they have higher columns and finer profiles than those just mentioned. The great **Temple of Zeus** at **Selinus** was the earliest of five colossal Greek temples of very nearly identical dimensions; it measured 360 feet by 167 feet in plan, but was never completed. During the second half of the sixth century important Doric temples were built at Pæstum in South Italy, and Agrigentum in Sicily; the somewhat primitive temple at Assos in Asia Minor, with uncouth carvings of centaurs and monsters on its architrave, belongs to this same period. The **Temple of Zeus** at **Agrigentum** (Fig. 33) is another singular and exceptional design, and was the second of the five colossal temples mentioned above. The temple was entirely enclosed by walls with engaged columns showing externally, and the roof was supported internally by two rows of massive columns. Colossal atlantes or applied statues figured in the design, but in what manner is not known. The temple was never completed.



FIG. 33.—TEMPLE OF ZEUS. AGRIGENTUM.

THE TRANSITION. During the transitional period there was a marked improvement in the proportions, detail, and workmanship of the temples. The cella was made broader, the columns

more slender, the entablature lighter. The triglyphs disappeared from the cella wall, and sculpture of a higher order enhanced the architectural effect. The profiles of the mouldings and especially of the capitals became more subtle and refined in their curves, while the development of the Ionic order in important monuments in Asia Minor was preparing the way for the splendors of the Periclean age. Three temples especially deserve notice: the **Aphæa* Temple** on the island of **Ægina,** the **Temple of Zeus** at **Olympia,** and the so-called **Theseum**—perhaps a temple of Heracles—in Athens. They belong to the period 470–450 B.C.; they are all hexastyle and peripteral, and without triglyphs on the cella wall. Of the three the second in the list is interesting as the scene of those rites which preceded and accompanied the Panhellenic Olympian games, and as the central feature of the Altis, the most complete temple-group and enclosure among all Greek remains. It was built of a coarse conglomerate, finished with fine stucco, and embellished with sculpture by the greatest masters of the time. The adjacent **Heraion** (temple of Hera) was a highly venerated and ancient shrine, originally built with wooden columns which, according to Pausanias, were replaced one by one, as they decayed, by stone columns. The truth of this statement is attested by the discovery of a singular variety of capitals among its ruins, corresponding to the various periods at which they were added. The Theseum is the most perfectly preserved of all Greek temples, and in the refinement of its forms is only surpassed by those of the Periclean age.

THE PERICLEAN AGE. The Persian wars may be taken as the dividing line between the Transition period and the Periclean age. The *élan* of national enthusiasm that followed the expulsion of the invader, and the glory and wealth which accrued to Athens as the champion of all Hellas, resulted in a splendid reconstruction of the Attic monuments as well as a revival of

* Formerly identified with the Temple of Zeus described by Pausanias; claimed also until recently as a Temple of Athena.

building activity in Asia Minor. By the wise administration of Pericles and by the genius of Ictinus, Phidias, and other artists of surpassing skill, the Acropolis at Athens was crowned with a group of buildings and statues absolutely unrivalled. Chief among them was the **Parthenon,** the shrine of Athena Parthenos, which the critics of all schools have agreed in considering the

FIG. 34.—RUINS OF THE PARTHENON.

most faultless in design and execution of all buildings erected by man (Figs. 31, 34, and Frontispiece). It was an octastyle peripteral temple, with seventeen columns on the side, and measured 220 by 100 feet on the top of the stylobate. It was the work of Ictinus and Callicrates, built to enshrine the noble statue of the goddess by Phidias, a standing chryselephantine figure forty feet high. It was the masterpiece of Greek architecture not only by reason of its refinements of detail, but also on account of the beauty of its sculptural adornments. The frieze about the cella wall

under the pteroma ceiling, representing in low relief with masterly skill the Panathenaic procession; the sculptured groups in the metopes, and the superb assemblages of Olympic and symbolic figures of colossal size in the pediments, added their majesty to the perfection of the architecture. Here also the horizontal curvatures and other refinements are found in their highest development. Northward from it, upon the Acropolis, stood the **Erechtheum,** an excellent example of the Attic-Ionic style (Figs. 35, 36). Its singular irregularities of plan and level, and the variety of its detail, exhibit in a striking way the Greek indifference to mere formal symmetry when confronted by practical considerations. The motive in this case was the desire to include in one design several existing and venerated shrines to Attic deities and heroes—Athena Polias, Poseidon, Pandrosus, Erechtheus, Boutes, etc. Begun by unknown architects in 479 B.C., and not completed until 408 B.C., it remains in its ruin still one of the most interesting and attractive of ancient buildings. Its two colonnades of differing design, its beautiful north doorway, and the unique and noble caryatid porch or balcony on the south side are unsurpassed in delicate beauty combined with vigor of design.* A smaller monument of the Ionic order, the amphiprostyle temple to **Nike Apteros**—



FIG. 35.—PLAN OF ERECHTHEUM.

* Recent investigations by the Greek Archæological Society in connection with repairs and a partial restoration of the Erechtheum, have brought to light many peculiarities of design and construction hitherto unknown. In the course of this work, Mr. G. P. Stevens, representing the Archæological Institute of America, was able to demonstrate the existence in the east wall of the original structure of two windows, as shown in Figure 35, which, as well as Figure 36, was copied, with his permission, from his drawings (see Journal Archæol. Inst. of America, X., I. *et seq.*).

the Wingless Victory—stands on a projecting spur of the Acropolis to the southwest. It measures only 27 feet by 18 feet in plan; the cella is nearly square; the columns are sturdier than those of the Erechtheum, and the execution of the monument is admirable. It was the first completed of the extant buildings of the group of the Acropolis and dates from 466 B.C.



FIG. 36.—WEST END OF ERECHTHEUM, RESTORED.

In the **Propylæa** (Fig. 37), the monumental gateway to the Acropolis, the Doric and Ionic orders appear to have been combined for the first time (437 to 432 B.C.). It was the master work of Mnesicles. The front and rear façades were Doric hexastyles; adjoining the front porch were two projecting lateral wings employing a smaller Doric order. The central passageway led between two rows of Ionic columns to the rear porch, entered by five doorways and crowned, like the front, with a pediment. The whole was executed with the same splendor and perfection as the other buildings of the Acropolis, and was a worthy gateway to the group of noble monuments which crowned that citadel of the Attic capital. The two orders



FIG. 37.—PROPYLÆA AT ATHENS. PLAN.

were also combined in the temple of **Apollo Epicurius** at **Phigalæa** (Bassæ). This temple was erected in 430 B.C. by Ictinus, who used the Ionic order internally to decorate a row of projecting piers instead of free-standing columns in the naos, in which there was also a single Corinthian column of rather archaic design, which may have been used as a support for a statue or votive offering.

ALEXANDRIAN AGE. A period of reaction followed the splendid architectural activity of the Periclean age. A succession of disastrous wars—the Sicilian, Peloponnesian, and Corinthian—drained the energies and destroyed the peace of European Greece for seventy-five years, robbing Athens of her supremacy and inflicting wounds from which she never recovered. In the latter part of the fourth century, however, the triumph of the Macedonian empire over all the Mediterranean lands inaugurated a new era of architectural magnificence, especially in Asia Minor. The keynote of the art of this time was splendor, as that of the preceding age was artistic perfection. The Corinthian order came into use, as though the Ionic were not rich enough for the sumptuous taste of the time, and capitals and bases of novel and elaborate design embellished the Ionic temples of Asia Minor. In the temple of **Apollo Didymæus** at Miletus, the plinths of the bases were made octagonal and panelled with rich scroll-carvings; and the piers which buttressed the interior faces of the cella walls were given capitals of singular but elegant form, midway between the Ionic and Corinthian types. This temple belongs to the list of colossal edifices already referred to; its dimensions were 366 by 163 feet, making it the largest of them all. The famous **Artemisium** (temple of Artemis or Diana) at Ephesus measured 342 by 163 feet. Several of the columns of the latter were enriched with sculptured figures encircling the lower drums of the colossal shafts. The most lavish expenditure was bestowed upon small structures, shrines, and sarcophagi. The graceful monument still visible in Athens, erected by the chorægus Lysicrates in token of his vic-

tory in the choral competitions, belongs to this period (330 B.C.). It is circular, with a slightly domical imbricated roof, and is decorated with elegant engaged Corinthian columns (Fig. 38). In the Imperial Museum at Constantinople are several sarcophagi of this period, found at Sidon, but executed by Greek artists, and of exceptional beauty. They are in the form of temples or shrines; the finest of them, supposed by some to have been made for Alexander's favorite general Perdiccas, and by others for the Persian satrap who figures prominently on its sculptured reliefs, is the most sumptuous work of the kind in existence. The exquisite polychromy of its beautiful reliefs and the perfection of its rich details of cornice, pediment, tiling, and crestings, make it an exceedingly interesting and instructive example of the minor architecture of the period.

FIG. 38.—CHORAGIC MONUMENT OF LYSICRATES.

(Restored model, N. Y.)

THE DECADENCE. After the decline of Alexandrian magnificence Greek art never recovered its ancient glory, but the flame was not suddenly extinguished. While in Greece proper the works of the second and third centuries B.C., are for the most part weak and lifeless, like the **Stoa of Attalus** (175 B.C.) and the **Tower of the Winds** (the Clepsydra of Andronicus Cyrrhestes, 100 B.C.) at Athens or the Portico of Philip in Delos, there were still a few worthy works built in Asia Minor. The splendid **Altar** erected at **Pergamon** by Eumenes II. (cir. 180 B.C.) in the Ionic order, combined sculpture of extraordinary vigor with imposing architecture in masterly fashion. At **Aizanoi** an Ionic **Temple to**

Zeus, by some attributed to the Roman period, but showing rather the character of good late Greek work, deserves mention for its elegant details, and especially for its frieze-decoration of acanthus leaves and scrolls resembling those of a Corinthian capital.

ROMAN PERIOD. During this period, *i.e.*, throughout the second and first centuries B.C., the Roman dominion was spreading over Greek territory, and the structures erected subsequent to the conquest partake of the Roman character and mingle Roman conceptions with Greek details and *vice versâ*. The temple of the **Olympian Zeus** at Athens (Fig. 39), a mighty dipteral Corinthian edifice measuring 354 by 171 feet, standing on a vast terrace or temenos surrounded by a buttressed wall, was begun by Antiochus Epiphanes (170 B.C.) on the site of an earlier unfinished Doric temple of the time of Pisistratus, and carried out under the direction of the Roman architect, Cossutius. It was not, however, finally completed until the time of Hadrian, 130 A.D. Meanwhile Sulla had despoiled it of several columns which he carried to Rome (86 B.C.), to use in the rebuilding of the temple of Jupiter on the Capitol, where they undoubtedly served as models in the development of the Roman Corinthian order. The columns were 57 feet high, with capitals of the most perfect Corinthian type; fifteen are now standing, and one lies prostrate near by. To the Roman period also belong the **Agora Gate** (cir. 35 B.C.), the **Arch of Hadrian** (117 A.D.), the **Odeon of Regilla** or of Herodes Atticus (143 A.D.), at Athens, the Propylæa at Eleusis, and many temples and tombs, theatres, arches, etc., in the Greek provinces.



FIG. 39.—TEMPLE OF OLYMPIAN ZEUS, ATHENS.

SECULAR MONUMENTS; PROPYLÆA. The stately gateway by which the Acropolis was entered has already been described.

It was the noblest and most perfect of a class of buildings whose prototype is found in the monumental columnar porches of the palace-group at Persepolis. The Greeks never used the arch in these structures, nor did they attach to them the same importance as did most of the other nations of antiquity. The Altis of Olympia, the national shrine of Hellenism, appears to have had no central gateway of imposing size, but a number of insignificant entrances disposed at random. The **Propylæa** of **Sunium, Priene** and **Eleusis** are the most conspicuous, after those of the Athenian Acropolis. Of these the Ionic gateway at Priene is the finest, although the later of the two at Eleusis is interesting for its anta-capitals. (*Anta* = a flat pilaster decorating the end of a wing-wall and treated with a base and capital usually differing from those of the adjacent columns.) These are of Corinthian type, adorned with winged horses, scrolls, and anthemions of an exuberant richness of design, characteristic of this late period.

The specifications have been preserved to us of an arsenal of the Periclean age at the Piræus, but no vestige of the structure itself remains, nor has any other building of like character been preserved.

COLONNADES, STOÆ. These were built to connect public monuments (as the Dionysiac theatre and Odeon at Athens); or along the sides of great public squares, as at Assos and Olympia (the so-called **Echo Hall**); or as independent open public halls, as the **Stoa Diple** at Thoricus. They afforded shelter from sun and rain, places for promenading, meetings with friends, public gatherings, and similar purposes. They were rarely of great size, and most of them are of rather late date, though the archaic structure at Pæstum, known as the **Basilica,** was probably in reality an open hall of this kind.

THEATRES, ODEONS. These were invariably cut out of the rocky hillsides, though in a few cases (Mantinæa, Myra, Antiphellus) a part of the seats were sustained by a built-up sub-

structure and walls to eke out the deficiency of the hill-slope under them. The front of the excavation was enclosed by a stage and a set scene or background, leaving somewhat over a semicircle for the *orchestra* enclosed by the lower tier of seats (Fig. 40). An altar to Dionysus (Bacchus) was the essential feature in the foreground of the orchestra, where the Dionysiac choral dance was performed. The seats formed successive steps of stone or marble sweeping around the sloping excavation, with carved marble thrones for the priests, archons, and other dignitaries. The only architectural decoration of the theatre was that of the set scene or *skene*, which with its wing-walls (*paraskenai*) enclosing the stage (*logeion*) was a permanent structure of stone or marble adorned with doors, cornices, pilasters, etc.* This has perished in nearly every case; but at Aspendus, in Asia Minor, there is one still fairly well preserved, with a rich architectural decoration on its inner face. The extreme diameter of the theatres varied greatly; thus at Aizanoi it is 187 feet, and at Syracuse 495 feet. One of the best preserved of Greek theatres is that at Epidaurus, the only one not altered fundamentally by the Romans. The theatre of Dionysus at Athens (finished 325 B.C.) could accommodate thirty thousand spectators.



FIG. 40.—PLAN OF GREEK THEATRE.
o, Orchestra; l, Logeion; p, Paraskenai; sk, Skene; st, st, Stoa.

The odeon differed from the theatre principally in being smaller and entirely covered in by a wooden roof. The **Odeon of**

* There has been much controversy over Dörpfeld's contention that the stage of the true Greek theatre was on a level with the orchestra and that the raised *logeion* is in every case a late addition; but the consensus of opinion seems to be against this view.

Regilla, built by Herodes Atticus in Athens (143 A.D.), is a well-preserved specimen of this class, but all traces of its cedar ceiling and of its intermediate supports have disappeared.

BUILDINGS FOR ATHLETIC CONTESTS. These comprised stadia and hippodromes for races, and gymnasia and palæstræ for individual exercise, bathing, and amusement. The *stadia* and *hippodromes* were oblong enclosures surrounded by tiers of seats and without conspicuous architectural features. The *palæstra* or *gymnasium*—for the terms are not clearly distinguished—was a combination of courts, chambers, tanks (*piscinæ*) for bathers and *exedræ* or semicircular tiers of seats for spectators; it served not merely for the exercises of athletes, but also for public recitations and entertainments. It was the prototype of the Roman thermæ, but simpler in plan and adornment. Every Greek city had one or more of them, but they have almost wholly disappeared, and the brief description by Vitruvius and scanty remains at Alexandria Troas and Ephesus furnish almost the only information we possess regarding their form and arrangement.

TOMBS. These are not numerous, and the most important are found in Asia Minor. The greatest of these is the famed **Mausoleum** at Halicarnassus in Caria, the monument erected to the king Mausolus by his widow Artemisia (354 B.C.; Fig. 41). It was designed by Satyrus and Pythius in the Ionic style, and comprised a podium or base 50 feet high and measuring 80 feet by 100 feet, in which was the sepulchre. Upon this base stood a cella surrounded by thirty-six Ionic columns, and crowned by a pyramidal roof, on the peak of which was a colossal marble quadriga at a height of 130 feet. It was superbly decorated by Scopas and other great sculptors with statues, marble lions, and a magnificent frieze. The British Museum possesses fragments of this most imposing monument. At Xanthus the **Nereid Monument,** so called from its sculptured figures of Nereides, was a somewhat similar design on a smaller scale, with sixteen Ionic columns. At Mylassa was another tomb with an open Corin-

thian colonnade supporting a roof formed in a stepped pyramid. Some of the later rock-cut tombs of Lycia at Myra and Antiphellus may also be counted as Hellenic works.



FIG. 41.—MAUSOLEUM AT HALICARNASSUS.
(As restored by the author.)

DOMESTIC ARCHITECTURE. Our knowledge of the typical Greek house is principally derived from literary sources, few remains of Greek houses having been found sufficiently well preserved to permit of restoring even the plan. It is probable that they resembled in general arrangement the houses of Pompeii (see p. 107); but that they were generally insignificant in size and decoration. The exterior walls were pierced only by the entrance doors, all light being derived from one or more interior courts. In the Macedonian epoch there must have been greater display and luxury in domestic architecture, but no remains have come down to us of sufficient importance or completeness to warrant further discussion.

MONUMENTS. In addition to those already mentioned in the text the following should be enumerated:

Prehistoric Period. In the Islands about Santorin, remains of houses antedating 1500 B.C.; at Tiryns the Acropolis, walls, and miscellaneous ruins; the like also at Mycenæ, besides various tombs; walls, gates, and houses of six successively superposed cities at Hissarlik (Troy, Ilios.); walls and gates at Samos, Thoricus, Menidi, Athens, etc. Extensive palace ruins in Crete.

Archaic Period. Doric Temples at Metapontium (by Durm assigned to 610 B.C.), Selinus, Agrigentum, Paestum; at Athens the first Parthenon; in Asia Minor the primitive Ionic Artemisium at Ephesus and the Heraion at Samos, the latter the oldest of colossal Greek temples.

Transitional Period. At Agrigentum, temples of Concord, Castor and Pollux, Demeter, Aesculapius, all circ. 480 B.C.; temples at Selinus and Segesta; at Delphi, temple of Apollo, various shrines, etc.

Periclean Period. In Athens the Ionic temple on the Illissus, destroyed during the last century; on Cape Sunium the temple of Athena, 430 B.C., partly standing; at Nemea, the temple of Zeus; at Tegea, the temple of Athena Elea (400? B.C.); at Rhamnus, the temples of Themis and of Nemesis; at Argos, two temples, stoa, and other buildings; all these were Doric.

Alexandrian Period. The temple of Dionysus at Teos; temple of Artemis Leucophryne at Magnesia, both about 330 B.C. and of the Ionic order; at Epidaurus, temple of Aesculapius, 380 B.C.; theatre; circular tholos (or well-house?), Corinthian internally, Doric externally, about 360 B.C.; portico, temple of Artemis, etc.

Decadence and Roman Period. At Athens the Stoa of Eumenes, circ. 170 B.C.; the monument of Philopappus on the Museum hill, 110 A.D.; the Gymnasium of Hadrian, 114 to 137 A.D.; the last two of the Corinthian order.

Theatres. Besides those already mentioned there are important remains of theatres at Argos, Segesta, Iassus (400? B.C.), Delos, Sicyon, Patara, and Thoricus; besides many others of less importance scattered through the Hellenic world. At Taormina are extensive ruins of a large Greek theatre rebuilt in the Roman period.

CHAPTER VIII.

ROMAN ARCHITECTURE

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: As before, Anderson and Spiers, Baumeister, Reber, Bühlmann (see General Bibliography). Canina, *L'Architettura antica descritta*, etc. Choisy, *L'Art de bâtir chez les Romains*. Dennis, *The Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria*. Desgodetz, *Rome in her Ancient Grandeur*. Durm, *Die Baukunst der Etrusker; Die Baukunst der Römer* (in *Hdbuch. d. Arch*). Lanciani, *Ancient Rome in the Light of Modern Discovery; New Tales of Old Rome; Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*. De Martha, *Archéologie étrusque et romaine*. Middleton, *The Remains of Ancient Rome*. Taylor and Cresy, *The Architectural Antiquities of Rome*.

LAND AND PEOPLE. The geographical position of Italy conferred upon her special and obvious advantages for taking up and carrying northward and westward the arts of civilization. A scarcity of good harbors was the only drawback amid the blessings of a glorious climate, fertile soil, varied scenery, and rich material resources. From a remote antiquity Dorian colonists had occupied the southern portion and the island of Sicily, enriching them with splendid monuments of Doric art; and Phœnician commerce had brought thither the products of Oriental art and industry. The founding of Rome (assigned by popular tradition to the date 753 B.C.) established the nucleus about which the sundry populations of Italy were to crystallize into the Roman nation, under the dominating influence of the Latin element. Later on, the absorption of the Etruscans added to this composite people a race of builders and engineers, as yet rude and uncouth in their art, but destined to become a powerful factor in develop-

ing the new architecture that was to spring from the contact of the practical Romans with the noble art of the Greek centres.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS. While the Greeks bequeathed to posterity the most perfect models of form in literary and plastic art, it was reserved for the Romans to work out the applications of these to every-day material life. The Romans were above all things a practical people. Their consummate skill as organizers is manifest in the marvellous administrative institutions of their government, under which they united the most distant and diverse nationalities. Seemingly deficient in culture, they were yet able to recast the forms of Greek architecture in new moulds, and to evolve therefrom a mighty architecture adapted to wholly novel conditions. They brought engineering into the service of architecture, which they fitted to the varied requirements of government, public amusement, private luxury, and the common comfort. They covered the antique world with arches and amphitheatres, with villas, baths, basilicas, and temples, all bearing the unmistakable impress of Rome, though wrought by artists and artisans of divers races. Only an extraordinary genius for organization could have accomplished such results.

The architects of Rome marvellously extended the range of their art, and gave it a flexibility by which it accommodated itself to the widest variety of materials and conditions. They made the arch and vault the basis of their system of design, employing them on a scale previously undreamed of, and in combinations of surpassing richness and majesty. They systematized their methods of construction so that soldiers and barbarians could execute the rough mass of their buildings, and formulated the designing of the decorative details so that artisans of moderate skill could execute them with good effect. They carried the principle of repetition of motives to its utmost limit, and sought to counteract any resulting monotony by the scale and splendor of the design. Above all they developed planning into a fine art,

displaying their genius in a wonderful variety of combination and in an unfailing sense of the demands of constructive propriety, practical convenience, and artistic effect. Where Egyptian or Greek architecture shows one type of plan, the Roman shows a score.

GREEK INFLUENCE. Previous to the closing years of the Republic the Romans had no art but the Etruscan. The few buildings of importance they possessed were of Etruscan design and workmanship, excepting a small number built by Greek hands. It was not until the Empire that Roman architecture took on a truly national form. True Roman architecture is essentially imperial. The change from the primitive Etruscan style to the splendors of the imperial age was due to the conquest of the Greek states. Not only did the Greek campaigns* enrich Rome with an unprecedented wealth of artistic spoils; they also brought into Italy hosts of Greek artists, and filled the minds of the campaigners with the ambition to realize in their own dominions the marble colonnades, the temples, theatres, and propylæa of the Greek cities they had pillaged. The Greek orders were adopted, altered, and applied to arcaded designs as well as to peristyles and other open colonnades. The marriage of the column and arch gave birth to a system of forms as characteristic of Roman architecture as the Doric or Ionic colonnade is of the Greek.

THE ROMAN ORDERS. To meet the demands of Roman taste the Etruscan column was retained with its simple entablature; the Doric and Ionic were adopted in a modified form; the Corinthian was developed into a complete and independent order, and the Composite was added to the list. An approximation to a standard system of proportions for all these five orders was gradually evolved, and the mouldings were profiled with arcs of circles instead of the subtler Greek curves. It must not be supposed, however, that all this was due to arbitrary rules imposed

* See p. 89.

by authority. It was a gradual convergence of practice due to growing experience, and the uniformity was much less than is sometimes imagined. In the building of many-storied structures the orders were superposed, the more slender over the sturdier, in an orderly and graded succession. The immense extent and number of the Roman buildings, the coarse materials often used, the relative scarcity of highly trained artisans, and above all, the necessity of making a given amount of artistic design serve for the largest possible amount of architecture, combined to direct the designing of detail into uniform channels. Thus in time was established a sort of canon of proportions, which was reduced to rules by Vitruvius, and revived in much more detailed and precise form by Vignola in the sixteenth century.



FIG. 42.—ROMAN DORIC ORDER (THEATRE OF MARCELLUS).*

In each of the orders, including the Doric, the column was given a base one half of a diameter in height (the unit of measurement being the diameter of the lower part of the shaft, the *crassitudo* of Vitruvius). The shaft was made to contract about one-sixth in diameter toward the capital, under which it was terminated by an *astragal* or collar of small mouldings; at the base it ended in a slight flare and fillet called the *cincture*. The entablature was in all cases given not far from one quarter the height of the whole column. The **Tuscan** order was a rudimentary or Etruscan Doric with a column seven diameters high and a simple entablature without triglyphs, mutules, or

* See footnote to Figure 26.

dentils. But few examples of its use are known. The **Doric** (Fig. 42) retained the triglyphs and metopes, the mutules and guttæ of the Greek; but the column was made eight diameters high, the shaft was smooth or had deep flutings separated by narrow fillets, and was usually provided with a simple moulded base on a square plinth. Mutules were used only over the triglyphs, and were even replaced in some cases by dentils; the corona was made lighter than the Greek, and a cymatium replaced the antefixæ on the lateral cornices. The **Ionic** (Fig. 43) underwent fewer changes, and these principally in the smaller mouldings and details of the capital. The column was approximately nine diameters high. The **Corinthian** order, the column of which was given a height of ten diameters, was made into an independent order by the designing of a special base of small *tori* and *scotiæ*, and by sumptuously carved *modillions* or brackets enriching the cornice and supporting the corona above a denticulated bed-mould (Fig. 44). Though the first designers of the modillion were probably Greeks, it must, nevertheless, be taken as really a Roman device, worthily completing the essentially Roman Corinthian order. The **Composite** was formed by combining into one capital portions of the Ionic and Corinthian, and giving to it a simplified form of the Corinthian cornice. The Corinthian order remained, however, the favorite order of Roman architecture.



FIG. 43.—ROMAN IONIC ORDER.

USE OF THE ORDERS. The Romans introduced many innovations in the general use and treatment of the orders. Mono-

lithic shafts were preferred to those built up of superposed drums. The fluting was omitted on these, and when hard and semi-precious stone like porphyry or verd-antique was the material, it was highly polished to bring out its color. These polished monoliths were often of great size, and they were used in almost incredible numbers.



FIG. 44.—CORINTHIAN ORDER (TEMPLE OF CASTOR AND POLLUX).

Another radical departure from Greek usage was the mounting of columns on pedestals to secure greater height without increasing the size of the column and its entablature. The Greek *anta* was developed into the Roman pilaster or flattened wall-column, and every free column, or range of columns perpendicular to the façade, had its corresponding pilaster to support the wall-end of the architrave. But the most radical innovation was the general use of engaged columns as wall-decorations or buttresses. The engaged column projected from the wall by more than half its diameter, and was built up with the wall as a part of its substance (Fig. 45). The entablature was in many cases advanced only over the columns, between which it was set back almost to the plane of the wall. This practice is open to the obvious criticism that it makes the column appear superfluous by depriving it of its

function of supporting the continuous entablature. The objection has less weight when the projecting entablature over the column serves as a pedestal for a statue or similar object, which restores to the column its function as a support (see the Arch of Constantine, Fig. 63).

ARCADES. The orders, though probably at first used only as free supports in porticoes and colonnades, were early applied as decorations to arcaded structures. This practice became general with the multiplication of many-storied arcades like those of the amphitheatres, the engaged columns being set between the arches as buttresses, supporting entablatures which marked the divisions into stories (Fig. 45). This combination has been assailed as a false and illogical device, but the criticism proceeds from a too narrow conception of architectural propriety. It is defensible upon both artistic and logical grounds; for it not only furnishes a most desirable play of light and shade and a pleasing contrast of rectangular and curved lines, but by emphasizing the constructive divisions and elements of the building and the vertical support of the piers, it also contributes to the expressiveness and vigor of the design.

FIG. 45.—ROMAN ARCADE WITH ENGAGED COLUMNS.
(From the Colosseum.)

VAULTING. The Romans substituted vaulting in brick, concrete, or masonry for wooden ceilings wherever possible, both in public and private edifices. The Etruscans were the first

vault-builders, and the Cloaca Maxima, the great sewer of Republican Rome (about 500 B.C.) still remains as a monument of their engineering skill. Probably not only Etruscan engineers (whose traditions were perhaps derived from Asiatic sources in the remote past), but Asiatic builders also from conquered eastern provinces, were engaged together in the development of the wonderful system of vaulted construction to which Roman architecture so largely owed its grandeur. Three types of vault were commonly used: the barrel-vault, the groined or four-part vault, and the dome.



FIG. 46.—BARREL VAULT.

The barrel-vault (Fig. 46) was generally semi-cylindrical in section, and was used to cover corridors and oblong halls, like the temple-cellas, or was bent around a curve, as in amphitheatre passages.

The groined vault is formed by the intersection of two barrel-vaults (Fig. 47). When several compartments of groined vaulting are placed together over an oblong plan, a double advantage is secured. Lateral windows can be carried up to the full height of the vaulting instead of being stopped below its springing; and the weight and thrust of the vaulting are concentrated upon a number of isolated points instead of being exerted along the whole extent of the side walls, as with the barrel-vault. The Romans saw that it was sufficient to dispose the masonry at these points in masses at right angles to the length of the hall, to resist better the lateral thrust of the vault. This appears clearly in the plan of the Basilica of Constantine (Fig. 58).


FIG. 47.—GROINED VAULT.
g, g, Groins.

The dome was in almost all Roman examples supported on a circular wall built up from the ground, as in the Pantheon (Fig. 54). The pendentive dome, sustained by four or eight arches over a square or octagonal plan, is not found in true Roman buildings.

The Romans made of the vault something more than a mere constructive device. It became in their hands an element of interior effect at least equally important with the arch and column. No style of architecture has ever evolved nobler forms of ceiling than the groined vault and the dome. Moreover, the use of vaulting, besides providing an absolutely fireproof form of roof, also made possible effects of unencumbered spaciousness and amplitude which could never be compassed by any combination of piers and columns. While Greece gave to architecture examples of perfect proportion and finish, the Romans endowed it with new resources and started it on wholly new lines of development of far-reaching importance.

CONSTRUCTION. The constructive methods of the Romans varied with the conditions and resources of different provinces, but were everywhere dominated by the same practical spirit. Their vaulted architecture demanded for the support of its enormous weights and for resistance to its disruptive thrusts, piers and buttresses of great mass. To construct these wholly of cut stone appeared preposterous and wasteful to the Roman. Italy abounds in clay, lime, and a volcanic product, *pozzolana*, which makes an admirable hydraulic cement. With these materials it was possible to employ unskilled labor for the great bulk of this massive masonry, and to erect with the greatest rapidity and in the most economical manner those stupendous piles which, even in their ruin, excite the admiration of every beholder.

STONE, CONCRETE, AND BRICK MASONRY. For buildings of an externally decorative character such as temples, arches of triumph, and amphitheatres, as well as in all places where brick and concrete were not easily obtained, stone was employed.

The walls were built by laying up the inner and outer faces in *ashlar* or cut stone, and filling in the intermediate space with rubble (random masonry of uncut stone) laid up in cement, or with concrete of broken stone and cement in successive layers, forming a conglomerate closely united with the face-masonry. In Syria and Egypt the local preference for stones of enormous size was gratified, and even surpassed, as in Herod's terrace-walls for the temple at Jerusalem (p. 40), and in the splendid structures of Palmyra and Baalbec. In Italy, however, stones of moderate size were preferred, and when blocks of unusual dimensions occur they are in many cases marked with false joints, dividing them into apparently smaller blocks, lest they should dwarf the building by their large scale. The general use in the Augustan period of marble for a decorative lining or wainscot in interiors led in time to the objectionable practice of coating buildings of concrete with an apparel of sham marble masonry, by carving false joints upon an external veneer of thin slabs of that material. Ordinary concrete walls were frequently faced with small blocks of tufa, called, according to the manner of its application, *opus reticulatum*, *opus incertum*, *opus spicatum*, etc. (Fig. 48.) In most cases, however, the facing was of carefully executed brickwork, covered sometimes by a coating of stucco. The bricks were large, measuring from one to two feet square where used for quoins or arches, but triangular where they served only as facings. Bricks were also used in the construction of skeleton ribs for concrete vaults of large span.

FIG. 48.—ROMAN WALL MASONRY.

a, *Brickwork*; *b*, *Tufa ashlar*; *r*, *Opus reticulatum*; *i*, *Opus incertum*.

VAULTING. Here, as in the wall-masonry, economy and common sense devised methods extremely simple for accomplishing vast designs. While the smaller vaults were, so to speak, cast

in concrete upon moulds made of rough boards, the larger vaults appear to have been often built with the aid of a skeleton of light ribs of brick, which served as supports for intermediate centrings on which to cast the concrete fillings between them. The whole vault, once hardened, formed really a monolithic curved lintel, exerting no thrust whatever, so that the extraordinary precautions against lateral disruption practised by the Romans were, in fact, in many cases quite superfluous.

DECORATION. The temple of Castor and Pollux in the Forum (long miscalled the temple of Jupitor Stator), is a typical example of Roman architectural decoration, in which richness was preferred to the subtler refinements of design (see Fig. 44). The splendid figure-sculpture which adorned the Greek monument would have been inappropriate on the theatres and thermæ of Rome or the provinces, even had there been the taste or the skill to produce it. Conventional carved ornament was substituted in its place, and developed into a splendid system of highly decorative forms. Two principal elements appear in this decoration—the acanthus-leaf, as the basis of a whole series of wonderfully varied motives; and symbolism, represented principally by what are technically termed *grotesques*—combinations of apparently incongruous natural forms, as when an infant's body terminates in a bunch of foliage (Fig. 49). Only to a limited extent do we find true sculpture employed as decoration, and that mainly for triumphal arches or memorial columns.

The architectural mouldings were nearly always carved, the Greek water-leaf and egg-and-dart forming the basis of most of the enrichments; but these were greatly elaborated and treated with more minute detail than the Greek prototypes. Friezes and bands were commonly ornamented with the foliated scroll or *rinceau*, which was as characteristic of Roman art as the anthemion was of the Greek. It consists of a continuous stem throwing out alternately on either side branches which curl into spirals and are richly adorned with rosettes, acanthus-leaves,

scrolls, tendrils, and blossoms. In the best examples the detail was modelled with great care and minuteness, and the motive itself was treated with extraordinary variety and fertility of invention. A derived and enriched form of the anthemion was sometimes used for bands and friezes; and grotesques, dolphins, griffins, infant genii, wreaths, festoons, ribbons, eagles, and masks are also common features in Roman relief carving.

FIG. 49.—ROMAN CARVED ORNAMENT.

(Lateran Museum.)

The Romans made great use of panelling and of moulded plaster in their interior decoration, especially for ceilings. The panelling of domes and vaults, in various geometric forms pleasingly combined, was usually roughly shaped in their first construction and finished afterward in stucco with rich mouldings and rosettes (Fig. 50). In works of a small scale the panels and decorations were wrought in relief in a heavy coating of plaster applied to the finished structure, and these stucco reliefs are among the most refined and charming products of Roman art. (Baths of Titus; baths at Pompeii; Palace of the Cæsars and tombs at Rome.)

COLOR DECORATION. Plaster was also used as ground for painting, executed in distemper, in fresco, or by the encaustic process, wax liquefied by a hot iron being the medium for applying the color in the latter case. Pompeii and Herculanum furnish countless examples of brilliant wall-painting in which strong primary colors form the ground, and a semi-naturalistic, semi-fantastic representation of figures, architecture and landscape is mingled with festoons, vines, and purely conventional ornament. Mosaic was also employed to decorate floors and wall-spaces, and sometimes for ceilings.* The later imperial baths and palaces were especially rich in mosaic of the kind called opus Grecanicum, executed with numberless minute cubes of stone or glass, as in the Baths of Caracalla and the Villa of Hadrian at Tivoli.



FIG. 50.—ROMAN CEILING PANELS. (*a*, From Palmyra; *b*, Basilica of Constantine.)

To the walls of monumental interiors, such as temples, basilicas, and thermæ, splendor of color was given by veneering them with thin slabs of rare and richly colored marble. No limit seems to have been placed upon the costliness or amount of these precious materials. Byzantine architecture borrowed from this practice its system of interior color decoration.

* See Van Dyke's *History of Painting*, p. 33.

CHAPTER IX.

ROMAN ARCHITECTURE—*Continued.*

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: Same as for Chapter VIII. Adams, *Ruins of the Palace of Spalatro.* Burn, *Rome and the Campagna.* Cameron, *Description of the Baths of the Romans.* Frothingham, *Roman Triumphal Arches.* Also, Guhl and Köner, *Life of the Ancient Greeks and Romans.* Mau, tr. by Kelcey, *Pompeii, its Life and Art.* Mazois, *Ruines de Pompeii.* Niccolini, *Le Case ed i Monumenti di Pompeii.* Von Presuhn, *Die neueste Ausgrabungen zu Pompeii.* Wood, *Ruins of Palmyra and Baalbec.*

THE ETRUSCAN STYLE. Although the first Greek architects were employed in Rome as early as 493 B.C., the architecture of the Republic was practically Etruscan until nearly 100 B.C. Its monuments, consisting mainly of city walls, tombs, and temples, are all marked by a general uncouthness of detail, denoting a lack of artistic refinement, but they display considerable constructive skill. In the Etruscan walls we meet with both polygonal and regularly coursed masonry; in both kinds the true arch appears as the almost universal form for gates and openings. A famous example is the Augustan Gate at Perugia, a late work rebuilt about 40 B.C., but thoroughly Etruscan in style. At Volaterræ (Volterra) is another arched gate, and in Perugia fragments of still another appear built into the modern walls.

The Etruscans built both structural and excavated tombs; they consisted in general of a single chamber with a slightly arched or gabled roof, supported in the larger tombs on heavy square piers. The interiors were covered with pictures; externally there was little ornament except about the gable and door-

way. The latter had a stepped or moulded frame with curious *crossettes* or ears projecting laterally at the top. The gable recalled the wooden roofs of Etruscan temples, but was coarse in detail, especially in its mouldings. Sepulchral monuments of other types are also met with, such as *cippi* or memorial pillars, sometimes in groups of five on a single pedestal (tomb at Albano).

Among the temples of Etruscan style that of **Jupiter Capitolinus** on the Capitol at Rome, destroyed by fire in 80 B.C., was the chief. Three narrow chambers side by side formed a cella nearly square in plan, preceded by a hexastyle porch of huge Doric, or rather Tuscan, columns arranged in three aisles, widely spaced and carrying ponderous wooden architraves. The roof was of wood; the cymatium and ornaments, as well as the statues in the pediment, were of terra-cotta, painted and gilded. The details in general showed acquaintance with Greek models, which appeared in debased and awkward imitations of triglyphs, cornices, antefixæ, etc.



FIG. 51.—TEMPLE FORTUNA VIRILIS. PLAN.

GREEK STYLE. The victories of Marcellus at Syracuse, 212 B.C., Fabius Maximus at Tarentum (209 B.C.), Flaminius (196 B.C.), Mummius (146 B.C.), Sulla (86 B.C.), and others in the various Greek provinces, steadily increased the vogue of Greek architecture and the number of Greek artists in Rome. The temples of the last two centuries B.C., and some of earlier date, though still Etruscan in plan, were in many cases strongly Greek in the character of their details. A few have remained to our time in tolerable preservation. The temple of **Fortuna Virilis** (really of Fors

Fortuna ?), of the second century (?) B.C., is a tetrastyle prostyle pseudoperipteral temple with a high *podium* or base, a typical Etruscan cella, and a deep porch, now walled up, but thoroughly Greek in the elegant details of its Ionic order (Fig. 51). Two circular temples, both called erroneously **Temples of Vesta,** one at Rome near the Cloaca Maxima, the other at Tivoli (Fig. 52), belong among the monuments of Greek style. The first was probably dedicated to Hercules, the second probably to the Sibyls; the latter being much the better preserved of the two. Both were surrounded by peristyles of eighteen Corinthian columns, and probably covered by conical roofs with gilded bronze tiles. The Corinthian order appears here complete with its modillion cornice, but the crispness of the detail and the fineness of the execution are Greek and not Roman. These temples date from about 72 B.C., though the one at Rome was probably rebuilt in the first century A.D.



FIG. 52.—CIRCULAR TEMPLE. TIVOLI.

IMPERIAL ARCHITECTURE: AUGUSTAN AGE. Even in the temples of Greek style Roman conceptions of plan and composition are dominant. The Greek architect was not free to reproduce textually Greek designs or details, however strongly he might impress with the Greek character whatever he touched. The demands of imperial splendor and the building of great edifices of varied form and complex structure, like the thermæ and

and amphitheatres, called for new adaptations and combinations of planning and engineering. The reign of Augustus (27 B.C.–14 A.D.) inaugurated the imperial epoch, but many works erected before and after his reign properly belong to the Augustan age by right of style. In general, we find in the works of this period the happiest combination of Greek refinement with Roman splendor. It was in this period that Rome first assumed the aspect of an opulent and splendid metropolis, though the way had been prepared for this by the regularization and adornment of the Roman Forum and the erection of many temples, basilicas, fora, arches, and theatres during the generation preceding the accession of Augustus. His reign saw the inception or completion of the portico of Octavia, the Augustan forum, the Septa Julia, the first Pantheon, the adjoining Thermæ of Agrippa, the theatre of Marcellus, the first of the imperial palaces on the Palatine, and a long list of temples, including those of the Dioscuri (Castor and Pollux), of Mars Ultor, of Jupiter Tonans on the Capitol, and others in the provinces; besides colonnades, statues, arches, and other embellishments almost without number.

LATER IMPERIAL WORKS. With the successors of Augustus splendor increased to almost fabulous limits, as, for instance, in the vast extent and the prodigality of ivory and gold in the famous Golden House of Nero. After the great fire in Rome, presumably kindled by the agents of this emperor, a more regular and monumental system of street-planning and building was introduced, and the first municipal building-law was decreed by him. To the reign of Vespasian (68–79 A.D.) we owe the rebuilding in Roman style and with the Corinthian order of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, the Baths of Titus, and the beginning of the Flavian amphitheatre or Colosseum. The two last-named edifices both stood on the site of Nero's Golden House, of which the greater part was demolished to make way for them. During the last years of the first century the Arch of Titus was erected, the Colosseum finished, amphitheatres built at Verona, Pola, Reggio,

Tusculum, Nimes (France), Constantine (Algiers), Pompeii and Herculanum (these last two cities and Stabiæ rebuilt after the earthquake of 63 A.D.), and arches, bridges, and temples erected all over the Roman world.

The first part of the second century was distinguished by the splendid architectural achievements of the reigns of Trajan (98–117) and Hadrian (117–138 A.D.). The works of this great age were marked by great dignity of conception as well as beauty of detail; they include the Forum and Basilica of Trajan and the Pantheon, besides many splendid works in the provinces. During the latter part of the century a very interesting series of buildings were erected in the Hauran (Syria), in which Greek and Syrian workmen under Roman direction produced examples of vigorous stone architecture of a mingled Roman and Syrian character.

The most remarkable thermæ of Rome belong to the third century—those of Caracalla (211–217 A.D.) and of Diocletian (284–305 A.D.)—their ruins to-day ranking among the most imposing remains of antiquity. In Syria the temples of the Sun at Baalbec and Palmyra (273 A.D., under Aurelian), and the great palace of Diocletian at Spalato, in Dalmatia (300 A.D.), are still the wonder of the few travellers who reach those distant spots.

While during the third and fourth centuries there was a marked decline in purity and refinement of detail, many of the later works of the period display a remarkable freedom and originality in conception. But these works are really not Roman, they are foreign, that is, provincial products; and the transfer of the capital to Byzantium revealed the increasing degree in which Rome was coming to look to the East for her strength and her art.

TEMPLES. The Romans built both rectangular and circular temples, and there was much variety in their treatment. In the rectangular temples a high *podium*, or basement, was substituted for the Greek stepped stylobate, and the prostyle plan was more common than the peripteral. The cella was relatively short and

wide, the front porch inordinately deep, and sometimes divided by longitudinal rows of columns into three aisles. In most cases the exterior of the cella in prostyle temples was decorated by engaged columns. A barrel vault gave the interior an aspect of spaciousness impossible with the Greek system of a wooden ceiling supported on double ranges of columns. In the place of these, free or engaged columns along the side-walls received the ribs of the vaulting. Between these ribs the ceiling was richly panelled, or coffered and sumptuously gilded. The temples of **Fortuna Virilis** (Fig. 51) and of **Faustina** at Rome (the latter built 141 A.D., and its ruins incorporated into the modern church of S. Lorenzo in Miranda), and the beautiful and admirably preserved **Maison Carrée,** at Nîmes (France; 4 A.D.), are examples of this type. In the temples of **Concord,** Julius, and **Vespasian,** all in the Forum, the porch was on the long side of the cella. Some of the larger temples were peripteral. The temple of the **Dioscuri** (Castor and Pollux) in the Forum, was one of the most magnificent of these, certainly the richest in detail (Fig. 44). Very remarkable



FIG. 53.—TEMPLE OF VENUS AND ROME. PLAN.

was the double temple of **Venus and Rome,** east of the Forum, built by the Emperor Hadrian about 130 A.D. (Fig. 53), a vast pseudodipteral edifice with two cellas meeting back to back in the center. The temple stood in the midst of an imposing columnar peribolus entered by magnificent gateways. Other important temples have already been mentioned.

Besides the two circular temples already described, the temple of Vesta, adjoining the House of the Vestals, at the east end of the Forum, should be mentioned. At Baalbec is a circular temple whose entablature curves inward between the widely-spaced columns until it touches the cella in the middle of each inter-columniation. It illustrates the caprices of design which sometimes resulted from the disregard of tradition and the striving after originality (273 A.D.).

THE PANTHEON. The noblest of all circular temples of Rome and of the world was the **Pantheon.** It was built by Hadrian, 117–138 A.D., on the site of the earlier rectangular temple of the same name erected by Agrippa. It measures 142 feet in diameter internally; the wall is 20 feet thick and supports a hemispherical dome rising to a height of 140 feet (Figs. 54, 55). Light is admitted solely through a round opening 28 feet in diameter at the top of the dome, the simplest and most impressive method of illumination conceivable. The rain and snow that enter produce no appreciable effect upon the temperature of the vast hall. There is a single entrance, with noble bronze doors, admitting directly to the interior, around which seven niches, alternately rectangular and semicircular in plan and fronted by Corinthian columns, lighten,



FIG. 54.—PLAN OF THE PANTHEON.

without weakening, the mass of the encircling wall. This wall was originally incrusted with rich marbles, and the great dome, adorned with deep coffering in rectangular panels, was decorated with rosettes and mouldings in gilt stucco. The dome appears to consist of a shell of brick with numerous arches and ribs covered with a heavier external shell of concrete. The interior panelling appears to the writer to have been hewn out of the mass of the brick vault regardless of the ribs and arches in its structure.



FIG. 55.—INTERIOR OF THE PANTHEON.

The exterior (Fig. 56) was less successful than the interior. The gabled porch of twelve superb granite columns 50 feet high, three-aisled in plan after the Etruscan mode, and covered originally by a ceiling of bronze, was a rebuilding with the materials and on the plan of the original pronaos of the Pantheon of Agrippa. The circular wall behind it is faced with fine brickwork, and displays, like the dome, many curious arrangements of discharging arches, reminiscences of traditional constructive precautions here wholly useless and fictitious because only skin-deep. A revetement of marble below and plaster above once concealed this brick facing. The portico, in spite of its too steep gable (once filled with a "gigantomachia" in gilt bronze) and its somewhat awkward association with a round building, is nevertheless a noble work, its capitals in Pentelic marble ranking

among the finest known examples of the Roman Corinthian. Taken as a whole, the Pantheon is one of the great masterpieces of the world's architecture.

FORA AND BASILICAS. The fora were the places for general public assemblage. The chief of those in Rome, the **Forum Magnum,** or **Forum Romanum**, was at first merely an irreg-



FIG. 56.—EXTERIOR OF THE PANTHEON.

(From model in Metropolitan Museum, New York.)

ular vacant space, about and in which, as the focus of the civic life, temples, halls, colonnades, and statues gradually accumulated. These chance aggregations the systematic Roman mind reduced in time to orderly and monumental form; successive emperors extended them and added new fora at enormous cost and with great splendor of architecture. Those of Julius, Augustus, Vespasian, and Nerva (or Domitian), adjoining the Roman Forum, were magnificent enclosures surrounded by high walls and single or double colonnades. Each contained a temple or basilica, besides gateways, memorial columns or arches, and countless statues. The **Forum of Trajan** surpassed all the

rest; it covered an area of thirty-five thousand square yards, and included, besides the main area, entered through a triumphal arch, the Basilica Ulpia, the temple of Trajan, and his colossal Doric column of Victory. Both in size and beauty it ranked as the chief architectural glory of the city (Fig. 57). The six fora together contained thirteen temples, three basilicas, eight triumphal arches, a mile of porticos, and a number of other public edifices.* Besides these, a network of colonnades covered large tracts of the city, affording sheltered communication in every direction, and here and there expanding into squares or gardens surrounded by peristyles.



FIG. 57.—FORUM AND BASILICA OF TRAJAN.

The public business of Rome, both judicial and commercial, was largely transacted in the *basilicas*, large buildings consisting usually of a wide and lofty central nave flanked by lower side-aisles, and terminating at one or both ends in an apse or semicircular recess called the *tribune*, in which were the seats for the magistrates. The side-aisles were separated from the nave by columns supporting a clearstory wall, pierced by windows above the roofs of the side-aisles. In some cases the latter were two stories high, with galleries; in others the central space was open to the sky, as at

* Lanciani: *Ancient Rome in the Light of Recent Discoveries*, p. 89.

Pompeii, suggesting the derivation of the basilica from the open square surrounded by colonnades, or from the forum itself, with which we find it usually associated. The most important basilicas in Rome were the **Sempronian,** the **Æmilian** (about 54 B.C.), the **Julian** in the Forum Magnum (51 B.C.), and the **Ulpian** in the Forum of Trajan (113 A.D.). The last two were probably open basilicas, only the side-aisles being roofed. The Ulpian (Fig. 57) was the most magnificent of all, and in conjunction with the Forum of Trajan formed one of the most imposing of those monumental aggregations of columnar architecture which contributed so largely to the splendor of the Roman capital.



FIG. 58.—BASILICA OF CONSTANTINE. PLAN.

These monuments frequently suffered from the burning of their wooden roofs. It was Constantine who completed the first vaulted and fireproof basilica, begun by his predecessor and rival, Maxentius, on the site of the former Temple of Peace (Figs. 58, 59). Its design reproduced on a grand scale the plan of the tepidarium-halls of the thermæ, the side-recesses of which were converted into a continuous side-aisle by piercing arches through the buttress-walls that separated them. Above the imposing vaults of these recesses and under the cross-vaults of the nave were windows admitting abundant light. A *narthex*, or porch, preceded the hall at one end; there were also a side entrance from the Via Sacra, and an apse or tribune for the magistrates opposite each of these entrances. The dimensions of the main hall (325×85 feet), the height of its vault (117 feet), and the splendor of its columns and incrustations excited universal admiration, and exercised a powerful influence on later architecture.

THERMÆ. The leisure of the Roman people was largely spent in the great baths, or *thermæ*, which took the place substan-

tially of the modern club. The establishments erected by the emperors for this purpose were vast and complex congeries of large and small halls, courts, and chambers, combined with a masterly comprehension of artistic propriety and effect in the sequence of oblong, square, oval, and circular apartments, and in the relation of the greater to the lesser masses. They were a com-



FIG. 59. BASILICA OF CONSTANTINE. RUINS.

bination of the Greek *palæstra* with the Roman *balnea*, and united in one harmonious design great public swimming-baths, private baths for individuals and families, places for gymnastic exercises and games, courts, peristyles, gardens, halls for literary entertainments, lounging-rooms, and all the complex accommodation required for the service of the whole establishment. They were built with apparent disregard of cost, and adorned with splendid extravagance. The earliest were the **Baths of Agrippa** (27 B.C.) behind the Pantheon; next may be mentioned those of **Titus,** built on the substructions of Nero's Golden House. The

remains of the **Thermæ of Caracalla** (211 A.D.) form the most extensive mass of ruins in Rome, and clearly display the admirable planning of this and similar establishments. A gigantic block of buildings containing the three great halls for cold, warm, and hot baths, stood in the centre of a vast enclosure surrounded by private baths, *exedræ*, and halls for lecture-audiences and other gatherings. The enclosure was adorned with statues, flower-gardens, and places for out-door games. The **Baths of Diocletian** (302 A.D.) embodied this arrangement on a still more extensive scale; they could accommodate 3,500 bathers at once, and their ruins cover a broad territory near the railway terminus of the modern city. The church of S. Maria degli Angeli was formed by Michael Angelo out of the *tepidarium* of these baths—a colossal hall 340×87 feet, and 90 feet high. The original vaulting and columns are still intact, and the whole interior most imposing, in spite of later stucco disfigurements. The circular *laconicum* (sweat-room) serves as the porch to the present church. It was in the building of these great halls that Roman architecture reached its most original and characteristic expression. Wholly unrelated to any foreign model, they represent distinctively Roman ideals, both as to plan and construction.



FIG. 60.—THERMÆ OF CARACALLA. PLAN OF CENTRAL BLOCK.

A, Caldarium, or Hot Bath; B, Intermediate Chamber; C, Tepidarium, or Warm Bath; D, Frigidarium, or Cold Bath; E, Peristyles; a, Gymnastic Rooms; b, Dressing Rooms; c, Cooling Rooms; d, Small Courts; e, Entrances; v, Vestibules.

PLACES OF AMUSEMENT. The earliest Roman theatres differed from the Greek in having a nearly semicircular plan, and in being built up from the level ground, not excavated in a hillside (Fig. 61). The first theatre was of wood, built by Mummius

145 B.C., and it was not until ninety years later that stone was first substituted for the more perishable material, in the theatre of Pompey. The **Theatre of Marcellus** (23–13 B.C.) is in part still extant, and later theatres in Pompeii, Orange (France), and in the Asiatic provinces are in excellent preservation. The orchestra was not, as in the Greek theatre, reserved for the choral dance, but was given up to spectators of rank; the stage was adorned with a permanent architectural background of columns and arches, and sometimes roofed with wood, and an arcade or colonnade surrounded the upper tier of seats. The amphitheatre was a still more distinctively Roman edifice. It was elliptical in plan, surrounding an elliptical arena, and built up with continuous encircling tiers of seats. The earliest stone amphitheatre was erected by Statilius Taurus in the time of Augustus. It was practically identical in design with the later and much larger Flavian amphitheatre, commonly known as the **Colosseum,** begun by Vespasian and completed 82 A.D. (Fig. 62). This immense structure measured 607 × 506 feet in plan and was 180 feet high; it could accommodate eighty-seven thousand spectators. Engaged columns of the Tuscan, Ionic, and Corinthian orders decorated three stories of the exterior; the fourth was a nearly unbroken wall with slender Corinthian pilasters. Solidly constructed of travertine, concrete, and tufa, the Colosseum, with its imposing but monotonous exterior, almost sublime by its scale and seemingly endless repetition, but lacking in refinement or originality of detail and dedicated to bloody and cruel sports, was a characteristic product



FIG. 61.—ROMAN THEATRE. (HERCULANUM.) (From model.)

of the Roman character and civilization. At Verona, Pola, Capua, and many cities in the foreign provinces there are well-preserved remains of similar structures.

Closely related to the amphitheatre were the circus and the stadium. The **Circus Maximus** between the Palatine and Aventine hills was the oldest of those in Rome. That erected by Caligula and Nero on the site afterward partly occupied by St. Peter's, was more splendid, and is said to have been capable of



FIG. 62.—COLOSSEUM. HALF PLAN.

accommodating over three hundred thousand spectators after its enlargement in the fourth century. The long, narrow race-course was divided into two nearly equal parts by a low parapet, the *spina*, on which were the goals (*metæ*) and many small decorative structures and columns. One end of the circus, as of the stadium also, was semicircular; the other was segmental in the circus, square in the stadium; a colonnade or arcade ran along the top of the building, and the entrances and exits were adorned with monumental arches.

TRIUMPHAL ARCHES AND COLUMNS. Rome and the provincial cities abounded in monuments commemorative of victory, usually single or triple arches with engaged columns and

rich sculptural adornments, or single colossal columns supporting statues. The arches were characteristic products of Roman design, and some of them deserve high praise for the excellence of their proportions and elegance of their details. There were in Rome in the second century A.D., thirty-eight of these monuments. The **Arch of Titus** (71–82 A.D.) is the simplest and most perfect of those still extant in Rome; the arch of **Septimius Severus** in the Forum (203 A.D.) and that of **Constantine** (330 A.D.) near the Colosseum, are more sumptuous but less pure in detail. The last-named was in part enriched with sculptures taken from the earlier arch of Trajan. The statues of Dacian captives on the attic (*attic* = a species of subordinate story added above the main cornice) of this arch were a fortunate addition, furnishing a *raison d'être* for the columns and broken entablatures on which they rest. Memorial columns of colossal size were erected by several emperors, both in Rome and abroad. Those of **Trajan** and of **Marcus Aurelius** are still standing in Rome in perfect preservation. The first was 140 feet high including the pedestal and the statue which surmounted it; its capital marked the height of the ridge levelled by the emperor for the forum on which the column stands. Its most striking peculiarity is the spiral band of reliefs winding around the shaft from bottom to top and representing the Dacian campaigns of Trajan. The other column is of similar design and dimensions, but greatly inferior to the first in execution.

FIG. 63.— ARCH OF CONSTANTINE.
(From model in Metropolitan Museum, New York.)

Both are really towers, with interior stair-cases leading to the top.

TOMBS. The Romans developed no special and national type of tomb, and few of their sepulchral monuments were of large dimensions. The most important in Rome were the pyramid of **Caius Cestius** (late first century B.C.), and the circular tombs of **Cecilia Matella** (60 B.C.), **Augustus** (14 A.D.) and **Hadrian,** now the Castle of S. Angelo (138 A.D.). The latter was composed of a huge cone of marble supported on a cylindrical structure 230 feet in diameter standing on a square podium 300 feet long and wide. The cone probably once terminated in the gilt bronze pine-cone now in the Giardino della Pigna of the Vatican. In the Mausoleum of Augustus a mound of earth planted with trees crowned a similar circular base of marble on a podium 220 feet square, now buried.

The smaller tombs varied greatly in size and form. Some were vaulted chambers, with graceful internal painted decorations of figures and vine patterns combined with low-relief enrichments in stucco. Others were designed in the form of altars or sarcophagi, as at Pompeii; while others again resembled ædiculæ, little temples, shrines, or small towers in several stories of arches and columns, as at St. Rémy (France).

PALACES AND DWELLINGS. Into their dwellings the Romans carried all their love of ostentation and personal luxury. They anticipated in many details the comforts of modern civilization in their furniture, their plumbing and heating, and their utensils. Their houses may be divided into four classes: the palace, the villa, the *domus* or ordinary house, and the *insula* or many-storied tenement built in compact blocks. The first three alone concern us, and will be taken up in the above order.

The imperial **palaces** on the Palatine Hill comprised a wide range in style and variety of buildings, beginning with the first simple house of Augustus (26 B.C.), burnt and rebuilt 3 A.D. Tiberius, Caligula, and Nero added to the Augustan group; Domi-

tian rebuilt a second time and enlarged the palace of Augustus, and Septimius Severus remodelled the whole group, adding to it his own extraordinary seven-storied palace, the Septizonium. The ruins of these successive buildings have been carefully excavated, and reveal a remarkable combination of dwelling-rooms, courts, temples, libraries, basilicas, baths, gardens, peristyles, fountains, terraces, and covered passages. These were adorned with a profusion of precious marbles, mosaics, columns, and statues. Parts of the demolished palace of Nero were incorporated in the substructions of the Baths of Titus. The beautiful arabesques and plaster reliefs which adorned them were the inspiration of much of the fresco and stucco decoration of the Italian Renaissance. At Spalato, in Dalmatia, are the extensive ruins of the great **Palace of Diocletian,** which was laid out on the plan of a Roman camp, with two intersecting avenues (Fig. 64). It comprised a temple, mausoleum, basilica, and other structures besides those portions devoted to the purposes of a royal residence.



FIG. 64.—PALACE OF DIOCLETIAN. SPALATO.

The **villa** was in reality a country palace, arranged with special reference to the prevailing winds, exposure to the sun and shade, and the enjoyment of a wide prospect. Baths, temples, *exedræ*, theatres, tennis-courts, sun-rooms, and shaded porticos were connected with the house proper, which was built around two or

three interior courts or peristyles. Statues, fountains, and colossal vases of marble adorned the grounds, which were laid out in terraces and treated with all the fantastic arts of the Roman landscape-gardener. The most elaborate and extensive villa was that of **Hadrian,** at Tibur (Tivoli); its ruins, covering hundreds of acres, form one of the most interesting spots to visit in the neighborhood of Rome.



FIG. 65.—HOUSE OF PANSA, POMPEII.

s, Shops; v, Vestibule; f, Family Rooms; k, Kitchen; l, Lararium; P, P, P, Peristyles.

There are few remains in Rome of the **domus** or private house. Two, however, have left remarkably interesting ruins—the **Atrium Vestæ,** or House of the Vestal Virgins, east of the Forum, a well-planned and extensive house surrounding a cloister or court; and the **House of Livia,** or Germanicus, so-called, on the Palatine Hill, the walls and decorations of which are excellently preserved. The typical Roman house in a provincial town is best illustrated by the ruins of Pompeii and Herculanum, which, buried by an eruption of Vesuvius in 79 A.D., have been partially excavated since 1721. The Pompeiian house (Fig. 65) consisted of several courts or *atria*, some of which were surrounded by colonnades and called *peristyles*. The front portion was reserved for shops, or presented to the street a wall unbroken

save by the entrance; all the rooms and chambers opened upon the interior courts, from which alone they borrowed their light. In the brilliant climate of southern Italy windows were little needed, as sufficient light was admitted by the door, closed only by portières for the most part; especially as the family life was passed mainly in the shaded courts, to which fountains, parterres of shrubbery, statues, and other adornments lent their inviting charm. The general plan of these houses seems to have been of Greek origin, as well as the system of decoration used on the walls. These, when not wainscoted with marble, were covered with fantastic, but often artistic, painted decorations, in which an imaginary architecture as of metal, a fantastic and arbitrary perspective, illusory pictures, and highly finished figures were the chief elements. These were executed in brilliant colors with excellent effect. The houses were lightly built, with wooden ceilings and roofs instead of vaulting, and usually with but one story on account of the danger from earthquakes. That the workmanship and decoration were in the capital often superior to what was to be found in a provincial town like Pompeii, is evidenced by beautiful wall-paintings and reliefs discovered in Rome in 1879 and now preserved in the Museo delle Terme. More or less fragmentary remains of Roman houses have been found in almost every corner of the Roman empire, but nowhere exhibiting as completely as in Pompeii the typical Roman arrangement.

WORKS OF UTILITY. A word should be said about Roman engineering works, which in many cases were designed with an artistic sense of proportion and form which raises them into the domain of genuine art. Such were especially the bridges, in which a remarkable effect of monumental grandeur was often produced by the form and proportions of the arches and piers, and an appropriate use of rough and dressed masonry, as in the Pons Ælius (Ponte S. Angelo), the great bridge at Alcantara (Spain), and the Pont du Gard, near Nîmes, in southern France. The aqueducts are impressive rather by their length, scale, and

simplicity, than by any special refinements of design, except where their arches are treated with some architectural decoration to form gates, as in the Porta Maggiore, at Rome.

PROVINCIAL WORKS. Besides the temples, theatres, baths, palaces, tombs and bridges already enumerated, in Palmyra, Baalbec, Nîmes, Orange, Reims, St. Rémy, Alcantara, etc., mention must be made of the extensive works of Roman architecture in northern Africa, especially in Algiers, at Timgad, Orleansville, El-Djem, Sbeitla, Lambessa and Tebessa; in Syria at Gerasa and in the necropolis of Petra; of city gates at Autun (France) and Treves (Germany, the Porta Nigra); of villas throughout northern Europe, including many in England (*e.g.* at Silchester); and the great Egyptian temples built under the Roman dominion (Esneh, Philae, Kardassy, etc.; see *ante* p. 22). In Paris are still preserved the remains of the palace and baths of Julian. Asia Minor abounds in splendid Greco-Roman theatres, temples and other ruins.

MONUMENTS. (Those which have no important extant remains are given in italics). TEMPLES: *Jupiter Capitolinus,* 600 B.C.; *Ceres, Liber, and Libera,* 494 B.C. (ruins of later rebuilding in S. Maria in Cosmedin); *first T. of Concord* (rebuilt in Augustan age), 254 B.C.; *first marble temple* in *portico of Metellus,* by a Greek, Hermodorus, 143 B.C.; temples of Fortune at Præneste and at Rome, and of Vesta at Rome, 83-78 B.C.; of Vesta at Tivoli, and of Hercules at Cori, 72 B.C.; *first Pantheon,* 27 B.C. In Augustan Age temples of *Apollo,* Concord rebuilt, Dioscuri, *Julius, Jupiter Stator, Jupiter Tonans,* Mars Ultor, Minerva (*at Rome* and Assisi), Maison Carrée at Nîmes, Saturn; at Puteoli, Pola, etc. *T. of Peace; T. Jupiter Capitolinus,* rebuilt 70 A.D.; temple at Brescia. Temple of Vespasian, 96 A.D.; also of *Minerva* in Forum of Nerva; *of Trajan,* 117 A.D.; second Pantheon; T. of Venus and Rome at Rome, and of Jupiter Olympus at Athens, 135-138 A.D.; Faustina, 141 A.D.; many in Syria; temples of Sun at *Rome,* Baalbec, and Palmyra, cir. 273 A.D.; of Romulus, 305 A.D. (porch S. Cosmo and Damiano). PLACES OF ASSEMBLY: FORA—Roman, Julian, 46 B.C.; Augustan, 40-42 B.C.; *of Peace,* 75 A.D.; Nerva, 97 A.D.; Trajan (by Apollodorus

of Damascus, 117 A.D. BASILICAS: *Sempronian, Æmilian,* 1st century B.C.; Julian, 51 B.C.; *Septa Julia,* 26 B.C.; the Curia, later rebuilt by Diocletian, 300 A.D. (now Church of S. Adriano); *at Fano,* 20 A.D. (?); Forum and Basilica at Pompeii, 60 A.D.; of Trajan; of Constantine, 310-324 A.D. THEATRES (th.) and AMPHITHEATRES (amp.): th. *Pompey,* 55 B.C.; of *Balbus* and of Marcellus, 13 B.C; th. and amp. at Pompeii and Herculanum; Colosseum at Rome, 78-82 A.D.; th. at Orange and in Asia Minor; amp. at Albano, Constantine, Nîmes, Petra, Pola, Reggio, Trevi, Tusculum, Verona, etc.; amp. Castrense at Rome, 96 A.D. Circuses and stadia at Rome. THERMÆ: of Agrippa, 27 B.C.; *of Nero;* of Titus, 78 A.D.; *Domitian,* 90 A.D.; Caracalla, 211 A.D.; Diocletian, 305 A.D.; *Constantine,* 320 A.D.; Gallienus ("Minerva Medica"), 3d century A.D.; at Pompeii, Stabian Baths, Baths of Forum, etc. ARCHES: *of Stertinius,* 196 B.C.; *Scipio,* 190 B.C.; *Augustus,* 30 B.C.; Titus, 71-82 A.D.; *Trajan,* 117 A.D.; Severus, 203 A.D.; Constantine, 320 A.D.; of Drusus, Dolabella, Silversmiths, 204 A.D.; Janus Quadrifrons, 320 A.D. (?); all at Rome. Others at Benevento, Ancona, Rimini in Italy; also at Athens, and at Reims and St. Chamas in France. Columns of Trajan, *Antoninus,* Marcus Aurelius at Rome; others at Constantinople, Alexandria, etc. TOMBS: along Via Appia and Via Latina, at Rome; Via Sacra at Pompeii; tower-tombs at St. Rémy in France; rock-cut at Petra; at Rome, of Caius Cestius and Cecilia Metella, 1st century B.C.; of Augustus, 14 A.D.; Hadrian, 138 A.D. PALACES and PRIVATE HOUSES: On Palatine, of Augustus, Tiberius, Nero, Domitian, Septimius Severus, *Elagabalus;* Villa of Hadrian at Tivoli; palaces of Diocletian at Spalato and *of Constantine* at Constantinople. House of Livia on Palatine (Augustan period); of Vestals, rebuilt by Hadrian, cir. 120 A.D. Houses at Pompeii and Herculanum, cir. 60-79 A.D., *e.g.,* of Pausa, of Diomed, of Tragic Poet, of Musician, of M. Holconius, of the Vettii; rustic villa at Boscoreale (walls removed to Metropolitan Museum, New York); Villas of Gordianus ("Tor' de' Schiavi," 240 A.D.), and *of Sallust* at Rome, and *of Pliny* at Laurentium.

CHAPTER X.

EARLY CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: Bunsen, *Die Basiliken christlichen Roms.* Butler, *Architecture and other Arts in Northern Central Syria.* Corroyer, *L'architecture romane.* Cummings, *A History of Architecture in Italy.* Dehio, *Kirchliche Baukunst des Abendlandes.* Essenwein (Hdbuch d. Arch.), *Ausgänge der klassischen Baukunst.* Gutensohn u. Knapp, *Denkmäler der christlichen Religion.* Hübsch, *Monuments de l'architecture chrétienne.* Lanciani, *Pagan and Christian Rome.* Mothes, *Die Basilikenform bei den Christen,* etc. Okely, *Development of Christian Architecture in Italy.* Von Quast, *Die altchristlichen Bauwerke zu Ravenna.* De Rossi, *Roma Sotterranea.* Venturi, *Storia de l'Arte Italiana.* De Vogüé, *Syrie Centrale; Églises de la Terre Sainte.*

INTRODUCTORY. The official recognition of Christianity by Licinius and later by Constantine* in the early years of the third century A.D., simply legalized an institution which had been for three centuries gathering momentum for its final conquest of the antique world. The new religion rapidly enlisted in its service for a common purpose and under a common impulse races as wide apart in blood and culture as those which had built up the art of imperial Rome. It was Christianity which reduced to civilization in the West the Germanic hordes that had overthrown Rome, bringing their fresh and hitherto untamed vigor to the task of recreating architecture out of the decaying fragments of classic art. So in the East its life-giving influence awoke the slumbering

* The celebrated Edict of Milan supposed to have been issued by Constantine in 313 A.D. is now believed to be a forgery.

Greek art-instinct to new triumphs in the arts of building, less refined and perfect indeed, but not less sublime than those of the Periclean age. Long before the Constantinian edict, the Christians in the Eastern provinces had enjoyed substantial freedom of worship. Meeting often in the private basilicas of wealthy converts, and finding these, and still more the great public basilicas, suited to the requirements of their worship, they early began to build in imitation of these edifices. There are many remains of these early churches in northern Africa and central Syria.

THE BASILICAN STYLE IN ROME. Early Christian art in Europe was at first wholly sepulchral, developing in the catacombs the symbols of the new faith. Once liberated, however, Christianity appropriated bodily for its public rites the basilica-type and the general substance of Roman architecture. Shafts and capitals, architraves and rich linings of veined marble, even the pagan Bacchic symbolism of the vine, it adapted to new uses in its own service. Constantine led the way in architecture, endowing Bethlehem and Jerusalem with splendid churches, and his new capital on the Bosphorus with the first of the three historic basilicas dedicated to the Holy Wisdom (Hagia Sophia). One of the greatest of innovators, he seems to have had a special predilection for circular buildings, and the tombs and baptisteries which he erected in this form, especially that known as Santa Costanza (Fig. 66), furnished the prototype for numberless Italian baptisteries in later ages.*



FIG. 66.—STA. COSTANZA, ROME.

The Christian basilica (see Figs. 67, 68) generally comprised

* It appears to be still uncertain whether this was erected as a tomb to the sister or a baptistery for the daughter of Constantine.

a broad and lofty nave, separated by rows of columns from the single or double side-aisles. The aisles had usually about half the width and height of the nave, and like it were covered with wooden roofs and ceilings. Above the columns which flanked the nave rose the lofty clearstory wall, pierced with windows above the side-aisle roofs and supporting the immense trusses of the roof of the nave. The timbering of the latter was sometimes bare, sometimes concealed by a richly panelled ceiling, carved, gilded, and painted. At the further end of the nave was the sanctuary or apse, with the seats for the clergy on a raised platform, the *bema*, in front of which was the altar. Transepts sometimes expanded to right and left before the altar, under which was the *confessio* or shrine of the titular saint or martyr.

An *atrium* or forecourt surrounded by a covered arcade preceded the basilica proper, the arcade at the front of the church forming a porch or *narthex*, which, however, in some cases existed without the atrium. The exterior was extremely plain; the interior, on the contrary, was resplendent with incrustations of veined marble and with sumptuous decorations in glass mosaic (called *opus Grecanicum*) on a blue or golden ground. Especially rich were the half-dome of the apse and the wall-space surrounding its arch and called the *triumphal arch;* next in decorative importance came the broad band of wall beneath the clearstory windows. Upon these surfaces the mosaic-workers wrought with minute cubes of colored glass pictures and symbols almost imperishable, in which the glow of color and a certain decorative grandeur of effect in the composition went far to atone for the uncouth drawing. With growing wealth and an increasingly elaborate ritual, the furniture and equipments of the church assumed greater architectural importance. A large rectangular space was retained for the choir in front of the bema, and enclosed by a breast-high parapet of marble, richly inlaid. On either side were the pulpits or *ambones* for the Gospel and Epistle. A lofty canopy was built over the altar, the *ciborium* or *baldaquin*, supported on

four marble columns. A few basilicas were built with galleries, as in S. Lorenzo and Sta. Agnese. Adjoining the basilica in the earlier examples were the baptistery and the tomb of the saint, circular or polygonal buildings usually; but in later times these were replaced by the font or baptismal chapel in the church and the *confessio* under the altar.

Of the two Constantinian basilicas in Rome, the one dedicated to **St. Peter** was demolished in the fifteenth century; that of **St. John Lateran** has been so disfigured by modern alterations as to be unrecognizable. The former of the two adjoined the site of the martyrdom of St. Peter in the circus of Caligula and Nero; it was five-aisled, 380 feet in length by 212 feet in width. The nave was 80 feet wide and 100 feet high, and the disproportionately high clearstory wall rested on horizontal architraves carried by columns. The impressive dimensions and simple plan of this structure gave it a majesty worthy of its rank as the first church of Christendom. **St. Paul beyond the Walls** (S. Paolo fuori le mura), built in 386 by Theodosius, resembled St. Peter's closely in plan (Figs. 67, 68). Destroyed by fire in 1823, it has been rebuilt with almost its pristine splendor, and is, next to the modern St. Peter's and the Pantheon, the most impressive place of worship in Rome. **Santa Maria Maggiore,*** though smaller in size, is more interesting because it so largely retains internally its original aspect, its Renaissance ceiling happily harmonizing with its simple antique lines. Ionic columns support architraves to carry the clearstory. In most other examples, St. Paul's included, arches turned from column



FIG. 67.—PLAN OF THE BASILICA OF ST. PAUL.

*Hereafter the abbreviation S. M. will be generally used instead of the name Santa Maria.

to column perform this function. The first known case of such use of classic columns as arch-bearers was in the palace of Diocletian at Spalato; it also appears in Syrian buildings of the third and fourth centuries A.D.

The basilica remained the model for ecclesiastical architecture in Rome, without noticeable change either of plan or detail, until the time of the Renaissance. All the earlier examples employed columns and capitals taken from ancient ruins, often incongruous and ill-matched in size and order. **San Clemente** (1108), built over the ruins of a sixth-century basilica, has retained almost intact its early aspect, its choir-enclosure, baldaquin, and ambones having been well preserved or carefully restored. Other important basilicas are mentioned in the list of monuments on pages 118, 119; of these the most important is **San Lorenzo,** a combination of two buildings, the earlier two-storied portion dating originally from Constantine's days, the nave from the fifth century; but both remodelled by Honorius III. early in the thirteenth century.

FIG. 68.—ST. PAUL BEYOND THE WALLS. INTERIOR.

RAVENNA. The fifth and sixth centuries endowed Ravenna with a number of notable buildings which, with the exception of the cathedral, demolished in the last century, have been preserved to our day. Subdued by the Byzantine emperor Justinian in 537, Ravenna became the meeting-ground for Early

Christian and Byzantine traditions and the basilican and circular plans are both represented. The two churches dedicated to St. Apollinaris, **S. Apollinare Nuovo** (520) in the city, and **S. Apollinare in Classe** (538), in what was formerly the port, are especially interesting for their fine mosaics, and for the impost-blocks interposed above the capitals of their columns to receive the springing of the pier-arches. These blocks appear to be somewhat crude modifications of the fragmentary architraves or entablatures employed in classic Roman architecture to receive the springing of vaults sustained by columns, and became common in Byzantine structures (Fig. 73). The use of external arcading to give some slight adornment to the walls of the second of the above-named churches, and the round bell-towers of brick which adjoined both of them, were first steps toward the development of the "wall-veil" or arcaded decoration, and of the campaniles, which in later centuries became so characteristic of north Italian churches (see Chapter XIII.). In Rome the campaniles which accompany many of the mediæval basilicas are square and pierced with many windows (see p. 163).

The basilican form of church became general in Italy, a large proportion of whose churches continued to be built with wooden roofs and with but slight deviations from the original type, long after the appearance of the Gothic style. The chief departures from early precedent were in the exterior, which was embellished with marble incrustations as in S. Miniato (Florence); or with successive stories of wall-arcades, as in many churches in Pisa and Lucca (see Fig. 94); until finally the introduction of clustered piers, pointed arches, and vaulting, gradually transformed the basilican into the Italian Romanesque and Gothic styles.

SYRIA AND THE EAST. In Syria, particularly the central portion, the Christian architecture of the third and eighth centuries produced a number of very interesting monuments. The churches built by Constantine in Syria—the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem (nominally built by his mother), of the Ascension

at Jerusalem, the magnificent octagonal church on the site of the Temple, and finally the somewhat similar church at Antioch—were the most notable Christian monuments in Syria. The first three on the list, still extant in part at least, have been so altered by later additions and restorations that their original forms are only approximately known from early descriptions. They were all of large size, and the octagonal church on the Temple platform was of exceptional magnificence. The columns and a part of the marble incrustations of the early design are still visible in the "Mosque of Omar," but most of the old work is concealed by the decoration of tiles applied by the Moslems, and the whole interior aspect altered by the wood-and-plaster dome with which they replaced the simpler roof of the original.



FIG. 69.—CHURCH AT KALB LOUZEH.

Christian architecture in Syria soon, however, diverged from Roman traditions. The abundance of hard stone, the total lack of clay or brick, the remoteness from Rome, led to a peculiar independence and originality in the forms and details of the ecclesiastical as well as of the domestic architecture of central Syria. These innovations upon Roman models resulted in the development of distinct types which, but for the arrest of progress by the Mohammedan conquest in the seventh century, would doubtless have inaugurated a new and independent style of architecture. Piers of masonry came to replace the classic column, as at Tafkha (third or fourth century), Rouheiha and Kalb Louzeh (fifth century? Fig. 69); the ceilings in the smaller churches were often formed with stone slabs; the apse was at first confined within the main rectangle of the plan, and

was sometimes square. The exterior assumed a striking and picturesque variety of forms by means of turrets, porches, and gables. Singularly enough, vaulting hardly appears at all, though the arch is used with fine effect. Conventional and monastic groups of buildings appear early in Syria, and that of **St. Simeon Stylites** at Kelat Seman is an impressive and interesting monument. Four three-aisled wings form the arms of a cross, meeting in a central octagonal open court, in the midst of which stood the column of the saint. The eastern arm of the cross forms a complete basilica of itself, and the whole cross measures 330 × 300 feet. Chapels, cloisters, and cells adjoin the main edifice.

Circular and polygonal plans appear in a number of Syrian examples of the early sixth century. Their most striking feature is the inscribing of the circle of polygon in a square which forms the exterior outline, and the use of four niches to fill out the corners. This occurs at Kelat Seman in a small double church, perhaps the tomb and chapel of a martyr; in the cathedral at **Bozrah** (Fig. 70), and in the small domical church of **St. George** at **Ezra.** These were probably the prototypes of many Byzantine churches like St. Sergius at Constantinople, and San Vitale at Ravenna (Fig. 74), though the exact dates of the Syrian churches are not known. The one at Ezra is the only one of the three which has a dome, the others having been roofed with wood.



FIG. 70.—CATHEDRAL AT BOZRAH.

The interesting domestic architecture of this period is preserved in whole towns and villages in the Hauran, which, deserted at the Arab conquest, have never been reoccupied and remain almost intact but for the decay of their wooden roofs. They

are marked by dignity and simplicity of design, and by the same picturesque massing of gables and roofs and porches which has already been remarked of the churches. The arches are broad, the columns rather heavy, the mouldings few and simple, and the scanty carving vigorous and effective, often strongly Byzantine in type.

Elsewhere in the Eastern world are many early churches of which even the enumeration would exceed the limits of this work. Salonica counts a number of basilicas and several domical churches. The church of **St. George,** now a mosque, is of early date and thoroughly Roman in plan and section, of the same class with the Pantheon and the tomb of Helena, in both of which a massive circular wall is lightened by eight niches. At Angora (Ancyra), Hierapolis, Pergamus, and other points in Asia Minor; in Egypt, Nubia, and Algiers, are many examples of both circular and basilican edifices of the early centuries of Christianity. In Constantinople there remains but a single representative of the basilican type, the church of **St. John Studius,** now the Emir Akhor mosque.

MONUMENTS: Rome: 4th century; St. Peter's, Sta. Costanza, 330?; Baptistery of St. John Lateran, 330; Sta. Pudentiana, 335 (rebuilt 1598); tomb of St. Helena; St. Paul's beyond the Walls, 386 (burned 1823, rebuilt late 19th century); St. John Lateran (wholly remodelled in modern times). 5th century: Sta. Sabina, 425; Sta. Maria Maggiore, 432; S. Pietro in Vincoli, 442 (greatly altered in modern times); San Stefano Rotondo. 6th century: S. Lorenzo, 580 (the older portion in two stories); SS. Cosmo e Damiano. 7th century: Sta. Agnese, 625; S. Giorgio in Velabro, 682. 8th century: Sta. Maria in Cosmedin; S. Crisogono. 9th century: S. Nereo ed Achilleo; Sta. Prassede; Sta. Maria in Dominica. 12th and 13th centuries: S. Clemente, 1108; Sta. Maria in Trastevere; S. Lorenzo (nave); Sta. Maria in Ara Coeli. Ravenna: Baptistery of S. John, 400 (?); S. Francesco; S. Giovanni Evangelista, 425; Sta. Agata, 430; S. Giovanni Battista, 439; tomb of Galla Placidia, 450; S. Apollinare Nuovo, 500-520; S. Apollinare in Classe,

538; St. Victor; Sta. Maria in Cosmedin (the Arian Baptistery); tomb of Theodoric (Sta. Maria della Rotonda, a decagonal two-storied mausoleum, with a low dome cut from a single stone 36 feet in diameter), 530-540. ITALY IN GENERAL, including ISTRIA: basilica at Parenzo, 540 and Pola (Istria); at Grado, 580; cathedral and Sta. Fosca at Torcello, 640-700; at Naples, Sta. Restituta, perhaps Sti. Angeli, Perugia, 7th century; others, mostly of 10th-13th centuries, at Murano near Venice, at Florence (S. Miniato), Spoleto, Toscanella, etc.; baptisteries at Asti, Florence, Nocera dei Pagani, and other places. In SYRIA AND THE EAST: basilicas of the Nativity at Bethlehem, of the Sepulchre and of the Ascension at Jerusalem; also polygonal church on Temple platform; these all of the 4th century. Basilicas at Bakouzah, Hass, Kelat Seman, Kalb Louzeh, Rouheiha, Tourmanin, etc.; circular churches, tombs, and baptisteries at Bozrah, Ezra, Hass, Kelat Seman, Rouheiha, etc.; all these 4th-8th centuries. Golden church at Antioch 6th century. Churches at Constantinople (Holy Wisdom, St. John Studius, etc.), Hierapolis, Pergamus, and Thessalonica (St. Demetrius, St. George, "Eski Djuma"); in Egypt and Nubia (Djemla, Announa, Ibreem, Siotu, etc.); at Orléansville in Algeria. (For churches, etc., of the 8th-10th centuries in the West, see Chapter XIII.)

CHAPTER XI.

BYZANTINE ARCHITECTURE.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: As before, Essenwein, Hübsch, Von Quast. Also, Bayet, *L'Art Byzantin.* Choisy, *L'Art de bâtir chez les Byzantins.* Couchaud, *Choix d'églises byzantines en Grèce.* Gayet, *L'Art byzantin d'après les monuments en Italie.* Holtzinger, *Die Sophienkirche und verwandte Bauten.* Lethaby and Swainson, *Sancta Sophia.* Ongania, *La Basilica di San Marco.* Pulgher, *Anciennes Églises Byzantines de Constantinople.* Salzenberg, *Altchristliche Baudenkmale von Constantinopel.* Texier and Pullan, *Byzantine Architecture.*

ORIGIN AND CHARACTER. The decline and fall of Rome arrested the development of the basilican style in the West, as did the Arab conquest later in Syria. It was otherwise in the new Eastern capital founded by Constantine in the ancient Byzantium, which was rising in power and wealth while Rome lay in ruins. Situated at the strategic point of the natural highway of commerce between East and West, salubrious and enchantingly beautiful in its surroundings, the new capital grew rapidly from provincial insignificance to metropolitan importance. Its founder had embellished it with an extraordinary wealth of buildings, in which, owing to the scarcity of trained architects, quantity and cost doubtless outran quality. But at least the tameness of blindly followed precedent was avoided, and this departure from traditional tenets contributed undoubtedly to the originality of Byzantine architecture. A large part of the artisans employed in building were then, as now, from Asia Minor and the Ægean Islands, Greek in race if not in name. An Oriental taste for brilliant and harmonious color and for minute decoration

spread over broad surfaces must have been stimulated by trade with the Far East and by constant contact with Oriental peoples, costumes, and arts. An Asiatic origin may also be assigned to the methods of vaulting employed, far more varied than the Roman, not only in form but also in materials and processes. From Roman architecture, however, the Byzantines borrowed the fundamental notion of their structural art; that, namely, of distributing the weights and strains of their vaulted structures upon isolated and massive points of support, strengthened by deep buttresses, internal or external, as the case might be. Roman, likewise, was the use of polished monolithic columns, and the incrustation of the piers and walls with panels of variegated marble, as well as the decoration of plastered surfaces by fresco and mosaic, and the use of *opus sectile* and *opus Alexandrinum* for the production of sumptuous marble pavements. In the first of these processes the color-figures of the pattern are formed each of a single piece of marble cut to the shape required; in the second the pattern is compounded of minute squares, triangles, and curved pieces of uniform size. Under these combined influences the artists of Constantinople wrought out new problems in construction and decoration, giving to all that they touched a new and striking character.

There is no absolute line of demarcation, chronological, geographical, or structural, between Early Christian and Byzantine architecture. But the former was especially characterized by the basilica with three or five aisles, and the use of wooden roofs even in its circular edifices; the vault being exceedingly rare, and the dome used only for small circular tombs and baptisteries. Byzantine architecture, on the other hand, rarely produced the simple three-aisled or five-aisled basilica. Nearly all its monuments were vaulted or domed, or both, and Byzantine architecture achieved its highest triumphs in the use of the *pendentive*, as the triangular spherical surfaces are called, by the aid of which a dome can be supported on the summits of four arches spanning

the four sides of a square, as explained later. There is as little uniformity in the plans of Byzantine buildings as in the forms of the vaulting. A few types of church-plan, however, predominated locally in one or another centre; but the controlling feature of the style was the dome and the constructive system with which it was associated. The dome, it is true, had long been used by the Romans, but always on a circular plan, as in the Pantheon.* It is also a fact that pendentives have been found in Syria and Asia Minor older than the oldest Byzantine examples. But the special feature characterizing the Byzantine dome on pendentives was its almost exclusive association with plans having piers and columns or aisles, with the dome as the central and dominant feature of the complex design (see plans, Figs. 74, 75, 76, 79). Another strictly Byzantine practice was the piercing of the lower portion of the dome with windows forming a circle or crown, and the final development of this feature into a high drum.

CONSTRUCTION. Still another divergence from Roman methods was in the substitution of brick and stone masonry for concrete. Brick was used for the mass as well as the facing of walls and piers, and for the vaulting in many buildings mainly built of stone. Stone was used either alone or in combination with brick, the latter appearing in bands of four or five courses at intervals of three or four feet. In later work a regular alternation of the two materials, course for course, was not uncommon. In piers intended to support unusually heavy loads the stone was very carefully cut and fitted, and sometimes tied and clamped with iron.

Vaults were built sometimes of brick, sometimes of cut stone; in a few cases even of earthenware jars fitting into each other, and laid up in a continuous contracting spiral from the base to the crown of a dome, as in San Vitale at Ravenna. Ingenious processes for building vaults without centrings were made use of—

* With the single exception of the Baths of Gallienus ("Minerva Medica"), 268 A.D.

processes inherited from the drain-builders of ancient Assyria, and still in vogue in Armenia, Persia, and Asia Minor. The groined vault was common, but always approximated the form of a dome, by a longitudinal convexity upward in the intersecting vaults. The aisles of Hagia Sophia* display a remarkable variety of forms in the vaulting.

DOMES. The dome, as we have seen, early became the most characteristic feature of Byzantine architecture; and especially the dome on pendentives. If a hemisphere be cut by five planes, four perpendicular to its base and bounding a square inscribed therein, and the fifth plane parallel to the base and tangent to the semicircular intersections made by the first four, there will remain of the original surface only four triangular spaces bounded by arcs or circles. These are called *pendentives* (Fig. 71 *a*). When these are built up of masonry, each course forms a species of arch, by virtue of its convexity. At the crown of the four arches on which they rest, these courses meet and form a complete circle, perfectly stable and capable of sustaining any superstructure that does not by excessive weight disrupt the whole fabric by overthrowing the four arches which support it. Upon these pendentives, then, a new dome may be started of any de-



FIG. 71.—DIAGRAM OF PENDENTIVES.

*"St. Sophia," the common name of this church, is a misnomer. It was not dedicated to a saint at all, but to the Divine Wisdom (Hagia Sophia), which name the Turks have retained in the softened form "Aya Sofia."

sired curvature, or even a cylindrical drum to support a still loftier dome, as in the later churches (Fig. 71 *b*). This method of covering a square is simpler than the groined vault, having no sharp edges or intersections; it is at least as effective architecturally, by reason of its greater height in the centre; and is equally applicable to successive bays of an oblong, cruciform, and even columnar building. In the great cisterns at Constantinople vast areas are covered by rows of small domes supported on ranges of columns.

The earlier domes were commonly pierced with windows at the base, this apparent weakening of the vault being compensated for by strongly buttressing the piers between the windows, as in Hagia Sophia. Here forty windows form a crown of light at the spring of the dome, producing an effect almost as striking as that of the simple *oculus* of the Pantheon, and celebrated by ancient writers in the most extravagant terms. In later and smaller churches a high drum was introduced beneath the dome, in order to secure, by means of longer windows, more light than could be obtained by merely piercing the diminutive domes.

Buttressing was well understood by the Byzantines, whose plans were skilfully devised to provide internal abutments, which were often continued above the roofs of the side-aisles to prop the main vaults, precisely as was done by the Romans in their thermæ and similar halls. But the Byzantines, while adhering less strictly than the Romans to traditional forms and processes, and displaying much more ready contrivance and special adaptation of means to ends, never worked out this pregnant structural principle to its logical conclusion as did the Gothic architects of Western Europe a few centuries later.

DECORATION. The exteriors of Byzantine buildings (except in some of the small churches of late date) were generally bare and lacking in beauty. The interiors, on the contrary, were richly decorated, color playing a much larger part than carving in the designs. Painting was resorted to only in the smaller buildings, the more durable and splendid medium of mosaic being usually

preferred. This was, as a rule, confined to the vaults and to those portions of the wall-surfaces embraced by the vaults above their springing. The colors were brilliant, the background being usually of gold, though sometimes of blue or a delicate green. Biblical scenes, symbolic and allegorical figures and groups of saints adorned the larger areas, particularly the half-dome of the apse, as in the basilicas. The smaller vaults, the soffits of arches, borders of pictures, and other minor surfaces, received a more conventional decoration of crosses, monograms, and set patterns.

FIG. 72.—SPANDRIL. HAGIA SOPHIA.

The walls throughout were sheathed with slabs of rare marble in panels so disposed that the veining should produce symmetrical figures. The panels were framed in billet-mouldings, derived perhaps from classic dentils; the billets or projections on one side the moulding coming opposite the spaces on the other. This seems to have been a purely Byzantine feature.

CARVED DETAILS. Internally the different stories were marked by horizontal bands and cornices of white or inlaid marble richly carved. The arch-soffits, the archivolts or bands around the arches, and the spandrils between them were covered with minute and intricate incised carving. The motives used, though based on the acanthus and anthemion, were given a wholly new aspect. The relief was low and flat, the leaves sharp and crowded, and the effect rich and lacelike, rather than vigorous.

It was, however, well adapted to the covering of large areas where general effect was more important than detail. Even the capitals were treated in the same spirit. The impost-block was almost universal, except where its use was rendered unnecessary by giving to the capital itself the massive pyramidal form required to receive properly the spring of the arch or vault. In such cases (more frequent in Constantinople than elsewhere) the surface of the capital was simply covered with incised carving of foliage, basketwork, monograms, etc.; rudimentary volutes in a few cases recalling classic traditions (Figs. 72, 73). The mouldings were weak and poorly executed, and the vigorous profiles of classic cornices were only remotely suggested by the characterless aggregations of mouldings which took their place.

FIG. 73.—CAPITAL WITH IMPOST BLOCK, S. VITALE.

PLANS. The remains of Byzantine architecture are almost exclusively of churches and baptisteries, but the plans of these are exceedingly varied. The first radical departure from the basilica-type seems to have been the adoption of circular or polygonal plans, such as had usually served only for tombs and baptisteries. The Baptistery of St. John at Ravenna (early fifth century) is classed by many authorities as a Byzantine monument. In the early years of the sixth century the adoption of this model had become quite general, and with it the development of domical

design began to advance. The church of **St. Sergius** at Constantinople (Fig. 74), originally joined to a short basilica dedicated to St. Bacchus (afterward destroyed by the Turks), as in the double church at Kelat Seman, was built about 520; that of **San Vitale** at Ravenna was begun a few years later; both are domical churches on an octagonal plan, with an exterior aisle. Semicircular niches —four in St. Sergius and eight in San Vitale—projecting into the aisle, enlarge somewhat the area of the central space and give variety to the internal effect. The origin of this characteristic feature may be traced to the eight niches of the Pantheon, through such intermediate examples as the temple of Minerva Medica at Rome.* The true pendentive does not appear in the two churches mentioned above. Timidly employed up to that time in small structures, it received a remarkable development in the magnificent church of **Hagia Sophia,** built by Anthemius of Tralles and Isodorus of Miletus, under Justinian, 532–538 A.D. In the plan of this marvelous edifice (Fig. 76) the dome rests upon four mighty arches bounding a square, into two



FIG. 74.—ST. SERGIUS, CONSTANTINOPLE.



FIG. 75.—PLAN OF S. VITALE, RAVENNA.

*The churches of St. George at Ezra and the Cathedral of Bozrah, both in Syria (see p. 117 and Figure 70) belong also to this group and time; as also San Lorenzo at Milan, and the adjoining baptistery and Chapel of St. Aquilin.

of which open the half-domes of semicircular apses. These apses are penetrated and extended each by two smaller niches and a central arch, and the whole vast nave, measuring over 200× 100 feet, is flanked by enormously wide aisles connecting at the front with a majestic narthex. Huge transverse buttresses, as in the Basilica of Constantine (with whose structural design this building shows striking affinities), divide the aisles each into three sections. The plan suggests that of St. Sergius cut in two, with a lofty dome on pendentives over a square plan inserted between the halves. Thus was secured a noble and unobstructed hall of unrivalled beauty, covered by a combination of half-domes increasing in span and height as they lead up successively to the stupendous central vault, which rises 180 feet into the air and fitly crowns the whole. The imposing effect of this low-curved but loftily poised dome, resting upon a crown of windows, its summit visible from every point of the nave (as



FIG. 76.—PLAN OF HAGIA SOPHIA.



FIG. 77.—SECTION OF HAGIA SOPHIA.

FIG. 78.—INTERIOR OF HAGIA SOPHIA, CONSTANTINOPLE.

may be easily seen from an examination of the section, Fig. 77), is not surpassed in any interior ever erected.

The two lateral arches under the dome are filled by clearstory walls pierced by twelve windows, and resting on arcades in two stories carried by magnificent columns taken from ancient ruins. These separate the nave from the two-storied side-aisles, which are vaulted with a remarkable variety of groined vaults. All the masses are disposed with studied reference to the complex thrusts exerted by the dome and other vaults. That the earthquakes of nearly fourteen centuries have not destroyed the church is the best evidence of the sufficiency of these precautions.

Not less remarkable than the noble planning and construction of this church was the treatment of scale and decoration in its interior design. It is as conspicuously the masterpiece of Byzantine architecture as the Parthenon was of the classic Greek. With little external beauty, it is internally one of the most perfectly composed and beautifully decorated halls of worship ever erected. Instead of the simplicity of the Pantheon it displays the complexity of an organism of admirably related parts. The division of the interior height into two stories below the spring of the four arches reduces the component parts of the design to moderate dimensions, so that the scale of the whole is more easily grasped and its vast size emphasized by the contrast. The walls are incrusted with precious marbles up to the spring of the vaulting; the capitals, spandrils, and soffits are richly and minutely carved with incised ornament, and all the vaults covered with splendid mosaics. Dimmed by the lapse of centuries and disfigured by the vandalism of the Moslems, this noble interior, by the harmony of its coloring and its impressive grandeur, is one of the masterpieces of all time (Fig. 78).

LATER CHURCHES. After the sixth century no monuments were built at all rivalling in scale the creations of the former period. The later churches were, with few exceptions, relatively small and trivial. Neither the plan nor the general aspect of

Hagia Sophia seems to have been imitated in these later works. The crown of dome-windows was replaced by a cylindrical drum under the dome, which was usually of insignificant size. The exterior was treated more decoratively than before, by means of bands and incrustations of colored marble, or alternations of stone and brick; and internally mosaic continued to be executed with great skill and of great beauty until the tenth century, when the art rapidly declined. These later churches, of which a number were spared by the Turks, are, therefore, generally pleasing and elegant rather than striking or imposing. The most noteworthy is the **Kahiré Djami** (formerly Moné tes Choras), of the tenth century, with remarkable mosaics in the narthex-vaults.

FOREIGN MONUMENTS. The influence of Byzantine art was wide-spread, both in Europe and Asia. The leading city of civilization through the Dark Ages, Constantinople influenced Italy through her political and commercial relations with Ravenna, Genoa, and Venice. The church of **St. Mark** in the latter city was one result of this influence (Figs. 79, 80). Begun in 976 to replace an earlier church destroyed by fire, and largely rebuilt between 1047 and 1071, it received through several centuries additions not always Byzantine in character. Yet it was mainly the work of Byzantine builders, who copied most probably the church of the Apostles at Constantinople, built by Justinian. The picturesque but wholly unstructural use of columns in the entrance porches, the upper parts of the façade, the wooden cupolas over the five domes, and the pointed arches in the narthex, are deviations from Byzantine traditions dating in part from the later Middle



FIG. 79.—PLAN OF ST. MARK'S, VENICE.

Ages. Nothing could well be conceived more irrational, from a structural point of view, than the accumulation of columns in the entrance-arches; but the total effect is so picturesque and so rich in color, that its architectural defects are easily overlooked. The external veneering of white and colored marble occurs rarely

FIG. 80.—INTERIOR OF ST. MARK'S.

in the East, but became a favorite practice in Venice, where it continued in use for five hundred years. The interior of St. Mark's, in some respects better preserved than that of Hagia Sophia, is especially fine in color, though not equal in scale and grandeur to the latter church. With its five domes it has less unity of effect than Hagia Sophia, but more of the charm of picturesqueness, and its less brilliant and simpler lighting enhances the impressiveness of its more modest dimensions. The church of **San Lorenzo** at Milan, though greatly altered in various re-

buildings, may be classed as Byzantine, with its octagonal rotunda, four apses, and surrounding aisle.

In Russia and Greece the Byzantine style has continued to be the official style of the Greek Church. The Russian monuments are for the most part of a somewhat fantastic aspect, the Muscovite taste having introduced many innovations in the form of bulbous domes and other eccentric details. In Greece there are few large churches, and some of the most interesting, like the old Cathedral at Athens, are almost toy-like in their diminutiveness. On **Mt. Athos** is an ancient monastery which still retains its Byzantine character and traditions. In Armenia (as at Ani, Etchmiadzin, etc.) are also interesting examples of late Armeno-Byzantine architecture, showing applications to exterior carved detail of elaborate interlaced ornament looking like a re-echo of Celtic MSS. illumination, itself, no doubt, originating in Byzantine traditions. But the greatest and most prolific offspring of Byzantine architecture appeared after the fall of Constantinople (1453) in the new mosque-architecture of the victorious Turks.

MONUMENTS. CONSTANTINOPLE: St. Sergius, 520; Hagia Sophia, 532-538; Holy Apostles by Justinian (demolished); Holy Peace (St. Irene), by Constantine, rebuilt by Justinian, and again in the 8th century by Leo the Isaurian; Hagia Theotokos, 12th century (also called St. Theodore); Moné tes Choras ("Kahiré Djami"), 10th century; Pantokrator; "Fetiyeh Djami." Cisterns, the "Bin Dir Direck" (1,001 columns) and "Yeré Batan Serai"; great hall of the Blachernæ palace. SALONICA: Churches of Divine Wisdom ("Aya Sofia"), St. Bardias, St. Elias. RAVENNA: San Vitale, 527-540; part of façade of palace of Theodoric. VENICE: St. Mark's, 1047-15th century; "Fondaco dei Turchi," now Civic Museum, 12th century. MILAN: San Lorenzo, 6th century. Other churches at Athens and Mt. Athos; at Daphni, Misitra, Myra, Ancyra, Ephesus, etc.; Monastery of St. Luke at Stiris; in Cyprus at St. Barnabas, Peristeroma, etc.; in Armenia at Ala-Werdi, Ani, Dighour, Etchmiadzin, Kouthais, Pitzounda, Usunlar, etc.; tombs at Ani, Varzhahan, etc.; in Russia at Kieff (St. Basil), Kostroma, Moscow (Assumption, Vasili Blaghennoi, etc.), Novgorod, Tchernigoff; at Kurtea Darghish in Wallachia, and many others.

CHAPTER XII.

SASSANIAN AND MOHAMMEDAN ARCHITECTURE.

(ARABIAN, MORESQUE, PERSIAN, INDIAN, AND TURKISH.)

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: Bourgoin, *Les Arts Arabes.* Coste, *Monuments du Caire; Monuments modernes de la Perse.* Cunningham, *Archæological Survey of India.* Fergusson, *Indian and Eastern Architecture.* De Forest, *Indian Architecture and Ornament.* Flandin et Coste, *Voyage en Perse.* Franz-Pasha, *Die Baukunst des Islam.* Gayet, *L'Art Arabe; L'Art Persan.* Girault de Prangey, *Essai sur l'architecture des Arabes en Espagne*, etc. Goury and Jones, *The Alhambra.* Jacob, *Jeypore Portfolio of Architectural Details.* Lane Poole, *Saracenic Art.* Le Bon, *La civilisation des Arabes; Les monuments de l'Inde.* Migeon, *Le Caire* (Series of *Villes d'Art*). Montani, *L'Architecture Ottomane.* Owen Jones, *Grammar of Ornament.* Parvillée, *Architecture et décoration turques.* Prisse d'Avennes, *L'Art Arabe.* Saladin et Migeon, *Manuel d'art mussulman.* Texier, *Description de l'Arménie, la Perse*, etc.

GENERAL SURVEY. While the Byzantine Empire was at its zenith, the new faith of Islam was conquering Western Asia and the Mediterranean lands with a fiery rapidity which is one of the marvels of history. The new architectural styles which grew up in the wake of these conquests, though differing widely in conception and detail in the several countries, were yet marked by common characteristics which set them quite apart from the contemporary Christian styles. The predominance of decorative over structural considerations, a predilection for minute surface-ornament, the absence of pictures and sculpture, are found alike

in Arabic, Persian, Turkish, and Indian buildings, though in varying degree. These new styles, however, were at first almost entirely the handiwork of artisans from the conquered races, and many traces of Byzantine, and even after the Crusades, of Norman and Gothic design, are recognizable in Moslem architecture. But the Orientalism of the conquerors and their common faith, tinged with the poetry and philosophic mysticism of the Arab, stamped these works of Copts, Syrians, and Greeks with an unmistakable character of their own, neither Byzantine nor Early Christian.

ARABIC ARCHITECTURE. In the building of mosques and tombs, especially at Cairo, this architecture reached a remarkable degree of decorative elegance, and sometimes of dignity. It developed slowly, the Arabs not being at the outset a race of builders; the sacred *Kaabah* at Mecca and the original mosque at Medina hardly deserved to be called architectural monuments at all. The most important early works were the mosques of **'Amrou** at Cairo (642, rebuilt and enlarged early in the eighth century), of **El Aksah** on the Temple platform at Jerusalem (691, by Abd-el-Melek), and of **El Walîd** at Damascus (705–732, rebuilt since the fire of 1893). All these were simple one-storied structures, with flat wooden roofs carried on parallel ranges of columns supporting pointed arches, the arcades either closing one side of a square court, or surrounding it completely. The long perspectives of the aisles and the minute decoration of the archivolts and ceilings alone gave them architectural character. The beautiful **Dome of the Rock** (Kubbet-es-Sakhrah, miscalled the Mosque of Omar) on the Temple platform at Jerusalem possibly recalls a Constantinian edifice, though its present form is that given by Soliman the Magnificent in 1520–66, preserving the original plan but with decorations of the restorer's time. Its plan resembles that of San Stefano Rotondo at Rome, and is clearly of Christian origin (see p. 116).

The splendid mosque of **Ibn Touloun** (876–885) was built

on the same plan as that of Amrou, but with cantoned piers instead of columns and a corresponding increase in variety of perspective and richness of effect. With the incoming of the Fatimite dynasty, however, and the foundation of the present city of Cairo (971), vaulting began to take the place of wooden ceilings, and then appeared the germs of those extraordinary applications of geometry to decorative design which were henceforth to be the most striking feature of Arabic ornament. Under the Ayûb dynasty, which began with Salâh-ed-din (Saladin) in 1172, these elements developed slowly in the domical tombs of the *Karajah* at Cairo, and prepared the way for the increasing richness and splendor of a long series of mosques, among which those of **Kalaoun** (1284–1318), **Sultan Hassan** (1356), **El Mu'ayyad** (1415), and **Kaît Bey** (1463), were the most conspicuous examples (Fig. 81). They mark, indeed, successive advances in complexity of planning, ingenuity of construction, and elegance of decoration. Together they constitute an epoch in Arabic architecture, which coincides



a *b*

FIG. 81.—MOSQUE OF SULTAN HASSAN, CAIRO: SANCTUARY.

a, Mihrâb; b, Mimber.

closely with the development of Gothic vaulted architecture in Europe, both in the stages and the duration of its advances.

The larger mosques of these three centuries are, like the mediæval monasteries, complex groups of buildings of various sorts about a central court of ablutions. The tomb of the founder, residences for the *imams*, or priests, schools (*medresseh*), and hospitals (*mâristân*) rival in importance the prayer-chamber. This last is, however, the real focus of interest and splendor; in some cases, as in Sultan Hassan, it is a simple barrel-vaulted chamber open to the court; in others an oblong arcaded hall with many small domes; or again a square hall covered with a high pointed dome on pendentives of intricately beautiful stalactite-work (see below). The ceremonial requirements of the mosque were simple. The court must have its fountain of ablutions in the centre. The prayer-hall, or mosque proper, must have its *mihrâb*, or niche, to indicate the *kibleh*, the direction of Mecca; and its *mimber*, or high, slender pulpit for the reading of the Kôran. These were the only absolutely indispensable features of a mosque, but as early as the ninth century the *minaret* was added, from which the call to prayer could be sounded over the city by the *mueddin*. Not until the Ayubite period, however, did it begin to assume those forms of varied and picturesque grace which lend to Cairo so much of its architectural charm.

ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS. While Arabic architecture, in Syria and Egypt alike, possesses more decorative than constructive originality, the beautiful forms of its domes, pendentives, and minarets, the simple majesty of the great pointed barrel-vaults of the Hassan mosque and similar monuments, and the graceful lines of the universally used pointed arch, prove the Coptic builders and their later Arabic successors to have been architects of great ability. The Arabic domes, as seen both in the mosques and in the remarkable group of tombs commonly called "tombs of the Khalifs," are peculiar not only in their pointed outlines and their rich external decoration of interlaced geometric motives, but

still more in the external and internal treatment of the pendentives, exquisitely decorated with stalactite ornament. This ornament, derived, apparently, from a combination of minute corbels with rows of small niches, and presumably of Persian origin, was finally developed into a system of extraordinary intricacy, applicable alike to the topping of a niche or panel, as in the great doorways of the mosques, and to the bracketing out of minaret galleries (Figs. 82, 83). Its applications show a bewildering variety of forms and an extraordinary aptitude for intricate geometrical design.

FIG. 82.—MOSQUE OF KAÎT BEY, CAIRO.

DECORATION. Geometry, indeed, vied with the love of color in its hold on the Arabic taste. Ceiling-beams were carved into highly ornamental forms before receiving their rich color-decoration of red, green, blue, and gold. The doors and the *mimber* were framed in geometric patterns with slender intersecting bars forming complicated star-panelling. The voussoirs of arches were cut into curious interlocking forms; doorways and niches were capped with stalactite corbelling, and pavements and wall-incrustations, whether of marble or tiling, combined brilliancy and harmony of color with the perplexing beauty of interlaced star-and-polygon patterns of marvellous intricacy. Stained glass added to the interior color-effect, the

patterns being perforated in plaster, with a bit of colored glass set into each perforation—a device not very durable, perhaps, but singularly decorative.

OTHER WORKS. Few of the mediæval Arabic palaces have remained to our time. That they were adorned with a splendid prodigality appears from contemporary accounts. This splendor was internal rather than external; the palace, like all the larger and richer dwellings in the East, surrounded one or more courts, and presented externally an almost unbroken wall. The fountain in the chief court, the *diwân* (a great, vaulted reception-chamber opening upon the court and raised slightly above it), the *dâr*, or men's court, rigidly separated from the *hareem* for the women, were and are universal elements in these great dwellings. The more common city-houses show as their most striking features successively corbelled-out stories and broad wooden eaves with lattice-screens covering single windows, or almost a whole façade, composed of spindle work (*mousharabiyé*), in designs of great beauty.

The fountains, gates, and minor works of the Arabs display the same beauty in decoration and color, the same general forms and details which characterize the larger works, but it is impossible here to particularize further with regard to them.

MORESQUE. Elsewhere in Northern Africa the Arabs produced important works in less abundance than in Egypt, and these are not so well preserved nor so well known. Constructive design would appear to have been there even more completely subordinated to decoration; tiling and plaster-relief took the place of more architectural elements and materials, while horse-shoe and cusped arches were substituted for the simpler and more architectural pointed arch (Fig. 84). The dome never found favor in North Africa, the great mosques of Kairouân, Tlemcen, Sfax, and Algiers showing the primitive plan of Ibn Touloun, with occasional small domes over the centre or at the ends. The courts of palaces and public buildings were surrounded by

ranges of horseshoe arches on slender columns; these last being provided with capitals of a form rarely seen in Cairo. It is noteworthy that the decoration of these mosques and palaces is less elaborate than that of the derived style in Spain. Towers were built of much more massive design than the Cairo minarets, usually with a square, almost solid shaft and a more open lantern at the top, sometimes in several diminishing stories; they are strikingly effective works.



FIG. 83.—MOORISH DETAIL, ALHAMBRA.

Showing stalactite and perforated work, Moorish cusped arch, Hispano-Moresque capitals, and decorative inscriptions.

HISPANO-MORESQUE. The most ornate phase of this branch of Arabic architecture is found not in Africa but in Spain, which was overrun in 710–713 by the Moors, who established there the independent Khalifate of Cordova. This was later split up into petty kingdoms, of which the most important were Granada, Seville, Toledo, and Valencia. This dismemberment of the Khalifate led in time to the loss of these cities, which were one by one recovered by the Christians during the fourteenth

and fifteenth centuries; the capture of Granada, in 1492, finally destroying the Moorish rule.

The dominion of the Moors in Spain was marked by a high civilization and an extraordinary activity in building. The style they introduced became the national style in the regions they occupied, and even after the expulsion of the Moors was used in buildings erected by Christians and by Jews. The "House of Pilate," at Seville, is an example of this, and the general use of the Moorish style in Jewish synagogues, down to our own day, both in Spain and abroad, originated in the erection of synagogues for the Jews in Spain by Moorish artisans and in Moorish style, both during and after the period of Moslem supremacy.

FIG. 84.—INTERIOR OF THE GREAT MOSQUE AT CORDOVA.

Besides innumerable mosques, castles, bridges, aqueducts, gates, and fountains, the Moors erected several monuments of remarkable size and magnificence. Specially worthy of notice among them are the Great Mosque at Cordova, the Alcazars of Seville and Malaga, the Giralda at Seville, and the Alhambra at Granada.

The **Mosque at Cordova,** begun in 786 by 'Abd-er-Rahman, enlarged in 876, and again by El Mansour in 976, is a vast arcaded hall 375 feet × 420 feet in extent, but only 30 feet high

(Fig. 84). The rich wooden ceiling rests upon seventeen rows of thirty to thirty-three columns each, and two intersecting rows of piers, all carrying horseshoe arches in two superposed ranges, a large portion of those about the sanctuary being cusped, the others plain, except for the alternation of color in the voussoirs. The *mihrab* niche is particularly rich in its minutely carved incrustations and mosaics, and a dome ingeniously formed by intersecting ribs covers the sanctuary before it. This form of dome occurs frequently in Spain.

The **Alcazars** at Seville and Malaga, which have been restored in recent years, present to-day a fairly correct counterpart of the castle-palaces of the thirteenth century. They display the same general conceptions and decorative features as the Alhambra, which they antedate. The **Giralda** at Seville is, on the other hand, unique among Spanish monuments, though resembling many Moroccan towers. It is a lofty rectangular tower, its exterior panelled and covered with a species of quarry-ornament in relief; it terminated originally in two or three diminishing stages or lanterns, which were replaced in the sixteenth century by the present Renaissance belfry.

The **Alhambra** is universally considered to be the masterpiece of Hispano-Moresque art, partly no doubt on account of its excellent preservation. It is most interesting as an example of the splendid citadel-palaces built by the Moorish conquerors, as well as for its gorgeous color-decoration of minute quarry-ornament stamped or moulded in the wet plaster wherever the walls are not wainscoted with tiles. It was begun in 1248 by Mohammed-ben-Al-Hamar, enlarged in 1279 by his successor, and again in 1306, when its mosque was built. Its plan (Fig. 85) shows two large courts and a smaller one next the mosque, with three great square chambers and many of minor importance. Light arcades surround the Court of the Lions with its fountain, and adorn the ends of the other chief court; and the stalactite pendentive, rare in Moorish work, appears in the "Hall of Ambassadors" and

some other parts of the edifice. But its chief glory is its ornamentation, less durable, less architectural than that of the Cairene buildings, but making up for this in delicacy and richness. Minute vine-patterns and Arabic inscriptions are interwoven with waving intersecting lines, forming a net-like framework, to all of which deep red, blue, black, and gold give an indescribable richness of effect.



FIG. 85.—PLAN OF THE ALHAMBRA.

A, Hall of Ambassadors; a, Mosque; b, Court of Mosque; c, Sala della Barca; d, d, Baths; e, Hall of the Two Sisters; f, f, f, Hall of the Tribunal; g, Hall of the Abencerrages.

The Moors also overran Sicily in the ninth century, but while their architecture there profoundly influenced that of the Christians who, after recovering Sicily in 1090, copied the style of the conquered Moslems, the only examples of the original Moorish architecture sufficiently important to claim mention in so brief a notice are the two buildings called **la Ziza** and **la Cuba**, small Moorish palaces at Palermo remodelled in the twelfth century by the Norman counts.

SASSANIAN. The Sassanian empire, which during the four centuries from 226 to 641 A.D. had withstood Rome and extended its own sway almost to India, left on Persian soil a number of interesting monuments which powerfully influenced the Mohammedan style of that region. The Sassanian buildings appear to have been principally palaces, and were all vaulted. With their long barrel-vaulted halls, combined with square domical chambers, as in Firouz-Abad and Serbistan, they exhibit reminiscences of

antique Assyrian tradition. The ancient Persian use of columns was almost entirely abandoned, but doors and windows were still treated with the banded frames and cavetto-cornices of Persepolis and Susa. The Sassanians employed with these exterior details others derived perhaps from Syrian and Byzantine sources. A sort of engaged buttress-column and blind arches repeated somewhat aimlessly over a whole façade were characteristic features; still more so the huge arches, elliptical or horse-shoe shaped, which formed the entrances to these palaces, as in the Tâk-Kesra at Ctesiphon, and from which Moorish architecture perhaps derived its preference for the horse-shoe arch. Ornamental details of a debased Roman type appear, mingled with more gracefully flowing leaf-patterns resembling early Christian Syrian carving. The last great monument of this style was the palace at Mashita in Moab, begun by the last Chosroes (627), but never finished, an imposing and richly ornamental structure about 500×170 feet, occupying the centre of a great court.

PERSIAN-MOSLEM ARCHITECTURE. These Sassanian palaces must have strongly influenced Persian architecture after the Arab conquest in 641. For although the architecture of the first six centuries after that date suffered almost absolute extinction at the hands of the Mongols under Genghis Khan, the traces of Sassanian influence are still perceptible in the monuments that rose in the following centuries. The dome and vault, the colossal portal-arches, and the use of brick and tile are evidences of this influence, bearing no resemblance to Byzantine or Arabic types. The Moslem monuments of Persia proper, so far as their dates can be ascertained, are all subsequent to 1200, except a number of ruined tombs, some of them near Bagdad with singular pyramidal roofs. The ruined mosque at Tabriz (1300) and the beautiful domical **Tomb** at **Sultaniyeh** (1313) belong to the Mogul period. They show all the essential features of the later architecture of the Sufis (1499–1694), during whose dynastic period were built the still more splendid and more celebrated **Meidan** or

square, the great mosque of Mesjid Shah, the Bazaar and the College or Medress of Hussein Shah, all at Ispahan, and many other important monuments at Ispahan, Bagdad, and Teheran. In these structures four elements especially claim attention; the pointed bulbous dome, the round minaret, the portal-arch rising above the adjacent portions of the building, and the use of enamelled terra-cotta tiles as an external decoration. To these may be added the ogee arch (*ogee*=double-reversed curve), as an occasional feature. The vaulting is most ingenious and beautiful, and its forms, whether executed in brick or in plaster, are sufficiently varied without resort to the perplexing complications of stalactite work, although the stalactite is freely used in interior decoration. In Persian decoration the most striking qualities are the harmony of blended color, broken up into minute patterns and more subdued in tone than in the Hispano-Moresque, and the preference of flowing lines and floral ornament to the geometric puzzles of Arabic design. Persian architecture influenced both Turkish and Indo-Moslem art, which owe to it a large part of their decorative charm.

Persian architecture is by no means confined to modern Persia; some of its most striking productions are to be seen in Bagdad, Mosul, Bokhara, Merv, and Samarkhand.

INDO-MOSLEM. The Mohammedan architecture of India is so distinct from all the native Indian styles and so related to the art of Persia, if not to that of the Arabs, that it properly belongs here rather than in the later chapter on Oriental styles. It was in the eleventh century that the states of India first began to fall before Mohammedan invaders, but not until the end of the fifteenth century that the great Mogul dynasty was established in Hindostan as the dominant power. During the intervening period local schools of Moslem architecture were developing in the Pathan country of Northern India (1193–1554), in Jaunpore and Gujerat (1396–1572), in Scinde, where Persian influence predominated; in Kalburgah and Bidar (1347–1426). These schools differed

considerably in spirit and detail; but under the Moguls (1494–1706) there was less diversity, and to this dynasty we owe many of the most magnificent mosques and tombs of India, among which those of Bijapur retain a marked and distinct style of their own.

The Mohammedan monuments of India are characterized by a grandeur and amplitude of disposition, a symmetry and monumental dignity of design which distinguish them widely from the picturesque but sometimes trivial buildings of the Arabs and Moors. Less dependent on color than the Moorish or Persian structures, they are usually built of marble, or of marble and sandstone, giving them an air of permanence and solidity wanting in other Moslem styles except the Turkish.



FIG. 86.—TOMB OF MAHMÛD, BIJAPUR. SECTION.

The dome, the round minaret, the pointed arch, and the colossal portal-arch are universal, as in Persia, and enamelled tiles are also used, but chiefly for interior decoration. Externally the more dignified if less resplendent decoration of surface carving is used, in patterns of minute and graceful scrolls, leaf forms, and Arabic inscriptions covering large surfaces. The Arabic stalactite pendentive, star-panelling and geometrical interlace are less frequent. The dome on the square plan is common, but neither the Byzantine nor the Arabic pendentive is used, striking and original combinations of vaulting surfaces, of corner squinches, of corbelling and ribs, being used in its place. Many of the Pathan domes and arches at Delhi, Ajmir, Ahmeda-

bad, Shepree, etc., are built in horizontal or corbelled courses supported on slender columns, and exert no thrust at all, so that they are vaults only in form, like the dome of the Tholos of Atreus (Fig. 24). The most imposing and original of all Indian domes are those of the **Jumma Musjid** and of the **Tomb of Mahmûd,** both at Bijapur, the latter 137 feet in span (Fig. 86). These two monuments, indeed, with the Mogul Taj Mahal at Agra, not only deserve the first rank among Indian monuments, but in constructive science combined with noble proportions and exquisite beauty are hardly, if at all, surpassed by the greatest triumphs of western art. The Indo-Moslem architects, moreover, especially those of the Mogul period, excelled in providing artistic settings for their monuments. Immense platforms, superb courts, imposing flights of steps, noble gateways, minarets to mark the angles of enclosures, and landscape gardening of a high order, enhance greatly the effect of the great mosques, tombs, and palaces of Agra, Delhi, Futtehpore Sikhri, Allahabad, Secundra, etc.

The most notable monuments of the Moguls are the **Mosque of Akbar** (1556–1605) at Futtehpore Sikhri, the tomb of that sultan at Secundra, and his palace at Allahabad; the **Pearl Mosque** at Agra and the **Jumma Musjid** at Delhi, one of the largest and noblest of Indian mosques, both built by Shah Jehan about 1650; his immense palace group in the same city; and finally the unrivalled mausoleum, the **Taj Mahal** at Agra, built during his lifetime as a festal hall, to serve as his tomb after death (Fig. 87). This last is the pearl of Indian architecture, though it is said to have been designed by a European architect, French or Italian. It is a white marble structure 185 feet square, centred in a court 313 feet square, forming a platform 18 feet high. The corners of this court are marked by elegant minarets, and the whole is dominated by the exquisite white marble dome, 58 feet in diameter, 80 feet high, internally rising over four domical corner chapels, and covered externally by a lofty marble bulb-

dome on a high drum. The rich materials, beautiful execution, and exquisite inlaying of this mausoleum are worthy of its majestic design. On the whole, in the architecture of the Moguls in Bijapur, Agra, and Delhi, Mohammedan architecture reaches its highest expression in the totality and balance of its qualities of



FIG. 87.—TAJ MAHAL, AGRA.

construction, composition, detail, ornament, and settings. The later monuments show the decline of the style and, though often rich and imposing, are lacking in refinement and originality.

TURKISH. Turkish art begins with the establishment of the Seljûk Sultanate of Iconium in Asia Minor in the twelfth century. The mosques and khans erected in this period at Konieh (Iconium) and Sivas are all in ruins, but exhibit a splendid wealth of design in stone, borrowing largely but not wholly from Persian sources.

In 1299 the Ottoman Turks overran the Seljûk empire, already crushed by the Mongols, and established a new capital in Bithynia under Osman I. at Brusa, where they built many mosques and tombs, partly with the help of Persian artists. They had already for a century been occupying the fairest portions of the Byzantine empire when, in 1453, they became masters of Constantinople. Hagia Sophia was at once occupied as their chief mosque, and such of the other churches as were spared were divided between the victors and the vanquished. The conqueror, Mehmet II., at the same time set about the building of a new mosque, entrusting the design to a Byzantine, Christodoulos, whom he directed to reproduce, with some modifications, the design of the "Great Church"—Hagia Sophia. The type thus officially adopted has ever since remained the controlling model of Turkish mosque design, so far, at least, as general plan and constructive principles are concerned. Thus the conquering Turks, educated by a century of study and imitation of Byzantine models in Brusa, Nicomedia, Smyrna, Adrianople, and other cities earlier subjugated, did what the Byzantines had, during nine centuries, failed to do. They grasped the possibilities of the Hagia Sophia type, and developed therefrom a style of architecture of great nobility and dignity. The low-curved dome with its crown of buttressed windows, the plain spherical pendentives, the great apses at each end, covered by half-domes and penetrated by smaller niches, the four massive piers with their projecting buttress-masses extending across the broad lateral aisles, the narthex and the arcaded atrium in front—all these appear in the great Turkish mosques of Constantinople. In the Conqueror's mosque, however, two apses with half-domes replace the lateral galleries and clearstory of Hagia Sophia, making a perfectly quadripartite plan, destitute of the emphasis and significance of a plan drawn on one main axis (Fig. 88). The same treatment occurs in the mosque of Ahmed I., the **Ahmediyeh** (1608; Fig. 89), and the **Yeni Djami** ("New Mosque") at the port (1665). In the mosque of

Osman III. (1755) the reverse change was effected; the mosque has no great apses, four clearstories filling the four arches under the dome, as also in several of the later and smaller mosques. The noble **mosque of Selim** and Soliman at Adrianople carries its dome upon eight piers, with alternate half-domes and clearstories, four of each. The greatest and finest of the Turkish mosques, the **Suleimaniyeh,** built in 1553 by Soliman the Magnificent, returned to the Byzantine combination of two half-domes and two clearstories (Fig. 90).



FIG. 88—MOSQUE OF MEHMET II., CONSTANTINOPLE. PLAN.

(The dimensions figured in metres.)

In none of these monuments is there the internal magnificence of marble and mosaic of the Byzantine churches. These are only in a measure replaced by Persian tile-wainscoting and stained-glass windows of the Arabic type. The division into stories and the the treatment of scale are less well managed than in Hagia Sophia; on the other hand, the proportion of height to width is generally admirable. The exterior treatment is unique and effective; the massing of domes and half-domes and roofs is artistically arranged; and while there is little of that minute carved detail found in Egypt and India, the composition of the lateral arcades, the domical peristyles of the courts, and the graceful forms of the pointed arches, with alternating voussoirs of white and black marble, are artistic in a high degree. The minarets are, however, inferior to those of Indian, Persian, and Arabic art, though graceful in their proportions.

Nearly all the great mosques are accompanied by the domical tombs (*turbeh*) of their imperial founders. Some of these are of noble size and great beauty of proportion and decoration. The **Tomb of Roxelana** (Khourrem), the favorite wife of Soliman the Magnificent (1553), is the most beautiful of all, and perhaps the most perfect gem of Turkish architecture, with its elegant

FIG. 89.—EXTERIOR AHMEDIYEH MOSQUE.

arcade surrounding the octagonal mausoleum-chamber. The **monumental fountains** of Constantinople also deserve mention. Of these, the one erected by Ahmet III. (1710), near Hagia Sophia, is the most beautiful. They usually consist of a rectangular marble reservoir with pagoda-like roof and broad eaves, the four faces of the fountain adorned each with a niche and basin, and covered with relief carving and gilded inscriptions.

PALACES. In this department the Turks have done little of importance. The buildings in the Seraglio gardens are low and insignificant. The **Tchinli Kiosque,** now the Imperial Museum, is however, a simple but graceful two-storied edifice, consisting of four vaulted chambers in the angles of a fine cruciform hall, with domes treated like those of Bijapur on a small scale; the tiling and the veranda in front are particularly elegant; the design suggests Persian handiwork. The later palaces, designed by Armenians, are picturesque white marble and stucco buildings on the water's edge; they possess richly decorated halls, but the details are of a debased European rococo style, quite unworthy of an Oriental monarch.

FIG. 90.—INTERIOR OF SULEIMANIYEH, CONSTANTINOPLE.

MONUMENTS. ARABIAN: "Mosque of Omar," or Dome of the Rock, 638; El Aksah, by 'Abd-el-Melek, 691, both at Jerusalem; Mosque of 'Amrou at Cairo, 642; mosques at Kairouan, 665; great mosque of El Walid, Damascus, 705-717. Bagdad built, 755. Great mosque at Kairouân, 737. At Cairo, Ibn Touloun, 876; Gama-El-Azhar, 971; "Tombs of Khalifs" (Karafah), 1250-1400; Moristan Kalaoun, 1284; Medresseh Sultan Hassan, 1356; Barkouk, 1382; El Azhar enlarged; El Mûayyad, 1415; Kaït Bey, 1463; Sinan Pacha at Boulak, 1568; El Bordeiny, 1638; "Tombs of Mamelukes,"

16th century. Also palaces, baths, fountains, mosques, and tombs. MORESQUE: Mosques at Tunis, Fez, Algiers, Tlemcen; mosque at Saragossa, 713; mosque and arsenal at Tunis, 742; great mosque at Cordova, 786, 876, 975; sanctuary, 14th century. Mosques, baths, etc., at Cordova, Tarragona, Segovia, Toledo, 960-980; mosque of Sobeiha at Cordova, 981. Palaces and mosques at Fez; great mosque at Seville, 1172. Extensive building in Morocco close of 12th century. Giralda at Seville, 1160; Alcazars in Malaga and Seville, 1225-1300; Alhambra and Generalife at Granada, 1248, 1279, 1306; also mosques, baths, etc. Yussuf builds palace at Malaga, 1348; palaces at Granada. PERSIAN: Tombs near Bagdad, 786 (?); mosque at Tabriz, 1300; tomb of Khodabendeh at Sultaniyeh, 1313; Meidan Shah (square) and Mesjid Shah (mosque) at Ispahan, 17th century; Medresseh (school) of Sultan Hussein, 18th century; palaces of Chehil Soutoun (forty columns) and Aineh Khaneh (Palace of Mirrors). Baths, tombs, bazaars, etc., at Cashan, Koum, Kasmin, etc. Aminabad Caravanserai between Shiraz and Ispahan; bazaar at Ispahan. Mosques and tombs at Bokhara and Samarkhand, Mosul, Ardebil, etc.

INDIAN: Mosque and "Kutub Minar" (tower) *cir.* 1200; Tomb of Altumsh, 1236; mosque at Ajmir, 1211-1236; tomb at Old Delhi; Adina Mosque, Maldah, 1358. Mosques Jumma Musjid and Lal Durwaza at Jaunpore, first half of 15th century. Mosque and bazaar, Kalburgah, 1435 (?). Mosques at Ahmedabad and Sirkedj, middle 15th century. Mosque Jumma Musjid and Tomb of Mahmûd, Bijapur, *cir.* 1550. Tomb of Humayûn, Delhi; of Mohammed Ghaus, Gwalior; mosque at Futtehpore Sikhri; palace at Allahabad; tomb of Akbar at Secundra, all by Akbar, 1556-1605. Palace and Jumma Musjid at Delhi; Muti Musjid (Pearl mosque) and Taj Mahal at Agra, by Shah Jehan, 1628-1658.

TURKISH: Seljûk ruins at Konieh and Sivas. Tomb of Osman, Brusa, 1326; Green Mosque (Yeshil Djami) Brusa, *cir.* 1350. Mosque at Isnik (Nicæa), 1376. Mehmediyeh (mosque Mehmet II.) Constantinople, 1453; mosque at Eyoub; Tchinli Kiosque, by Mehmet II., 1450-60; mosque Bayazid, 1500; Selim I., 1520; Mosque of Selim at Adrianople; Suleimaniyeh, by Sinan, 1553; Ahmediyeh, by Ahmet I., 1608; Yeni Djami, 1665; Nouri Osman, by Osman III., 1755; mosque Mohammed Ali in Cairo, 1824. Khans, cloistered courts for public business and commercial lodgers, various dates, 16th and 17th centuries (Validé Khan, Vizir Khan), vaulted bazaars, fountains, Seraskierat Tower, all at Constantinople.

CHAPTER XIII.

EARLY MEDIÆVAL ARCHITECTURE.

IN ITALY AND FRANCE.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: As for Chapter X, Corroyer, Cummings, Dehio. Also, Boito, *Architettura del medio evo in Italia.* Cattaneo, *L'Architecture en Italie.* Chapuy, *Le moyen age monumental.* De Dartein, *Etudes sur l'architecture lombarde.* Enlart, *Manuel d'archéologie française.* Hübsch, *Monuments de l'architecture chrétienne.* Knight, *Churches of Northern Italy.* Lenoir, *Architecture monastique.* Mothes, *Baukunst des Mittelalters in Italien.* Osten, *Bauwerke in der Lombardei.* Porter, *Mediæval Architecture.* Quicherat, *Mélanges d'histoire et d'archéologie.* Reber, *History of Mediæval Architecture.* Révoil, *Architecture romane du midi de la France.* Rohault de Fleury, *Monuments de Pise.* Sharpe, *Churches of Charente.* De Verneilh, *L'Architecture byzantine en France.* Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française* (especially in Vol. I., Architecture religieuse); *Discourses on Architecture.*

EARLY MEDIÆVAL EUROPE. The partition of the Roman Empire in the West in the fifth century A.D., and the ruin of its capital under successive assaults (Alaric 410, Attila, Genseric, Odoacer 476) marked the beginning of a new era in Western architecture. The so-called Dark Ages which followed these events constituted the formative period of the new Western civilization, during which the Celtic and Germanic races were being Christianized and subjected to the authority and to the educative influences of the Church. Under these conditions a new architecture was developed, founded upon the traditions of the early Christian builders, modified in different regions

by Roman or Byzantine influences. For Rome, even ruined, never wholly lost her antique prestige, and Roman monuments covering the soil of Southern Europe were a constant object lesson to the builders of that time. To this new architecture of the West, which in the tenth and eleventh centuries first began to achieve worthy and monumental results, the generic name of **Romanesque** has been commonly given, in spite of the great diversity of its manifestations in different countries.

CHARACTER OF THE ARCHITECTURE. Romanesque architecture was pre-eminently ecclesiastical. Civilization and culture emanated from the Church, and her requirements and discipline gave form to the builder's art. But the basilican style, which had so well served her purposes in the earlier centuries and on classic soil, was ill-suited to the new conditions. Corinthian columns, marble incrustations, and splendid mosaics were not to be had for the asking in the forests of Gaul or Germany, nor could the Lombards and Ostrogoths in Italy or their descendants reproduce them. The basilican style was complete in itself, possessing no seeds of further growth. The priests and monks of Italy and Western Europe sought to rear with unskilled labor churches of stone in which the general dispositions of the basilica should appear in simpler, more massive dress, and, as far as possible, in a fireproof construction with vaults of stone. This problem underlies all the varied phases of Romanesque architecture; its final solution was not, however, reached until the Gothic period, to which the Romanesque forms the transition and stepping-stone.

MEDIÆVAL ITALY. Italy in the early Middle Ages stood midway between the civilization of the Eastern Empire and the semi-barbarism of the West. Rome, Ravenna, and Venice early became centres of culture and maintained continuous commercial relations with the East. Architecture did not lack either the inspiration or the means for advancing on new lines. But its advance was by no means the same everywhere. The unifying influence of the church was counterbalanced by the provincialism

and the local diversities of the various Italian states, resulting in a wide variety of styles. These, however, may be broadly grouped in four divisions: the **Lombard,** the **Tuscan-Romanesque,** the **Italo-Byzantine,** and the unchanged **Basilican** or Early Christian, which last, as was shown in Chapter X., continued to be practised in Rome throughout the Middle Ages.

LOMBARD STYLE. Owing to the general rebuilding of ancient churches under the more settled social conditions of the

FIG. 91.—INTERIOR OF SAN AMBROGIO, MILAN.

eleventh and twelfth centuries, little remains to us of the architecture of the three preceding centuries in Italy, except the Roman basilicas and a few baptisteries and circular churches, already mentioned in Chapter X. The so-called Lombard monuments belong mainly to the eleventh and twelfth centuries, though a few churches and many fragmentary portions of others belong to earlier dates. They are found not only in Lombardy, but also in Venetia and the Æmilia. Milan, Pavia, Piacenza, Bologna, and Verona were important centres of development of this style. The churches were frequently vaulted, but the plans

were basilican, with such variations as resulted from efforts to meet the exigencies of vaulted construction. The nave was narrowed, and instead of rows of columns carrying a thin clearstory wall, a few massive piers of masonry, connected by broad pier-arches, supported the heavy ribs of the groined vaulting, as in S. Ambrogio, Milan (Fig. 91), which, in spite of the rebuilding of its vaults in 1507 (but on the original design), is now regarded as the earliest complete example of the style, and in San Michele, Pavia (Fig. 92). To resist the thrust of the main vault, the clearstory was sometimes suppressed, the side-aisle carried up in two stories forming galleries, and rows of chapels added at the sides, their partitions forming buttresses. The piers were often of clustered section, the better to receive the various arches and ribs they supported. This reveals the introduction of a new principle as well as of a new form into architectural design: the substitution of scientific logic for tradition in the adaptation of each structural member to its particular function. This principle is only dimly perceived in Byzantine and basilican architecture; in these Lombard piers and vaults it is frankly and vigorously applied. It is the germinant principle of all Gothic design. The vaulting was in square divisions or *vaulting-bays*, each embracing two pier-arches which met upon an intermediate pier lighter than the others. Thus the whole aspect of the interior was revolutionized. The spaciousness and decorative elegance of the basilicas were here exchanged for a severe and massive dignity; their lightness of construction on a simple system incapable of further development, for a heavy vaulted system destined to a scientific evolution extending through centuries of progress. The choir was sometimes raised a few



FIG. 92.—PLAN OF SAN MICHELE, PAVIA.

feet above the nave, to allow of a crypt and *confessio* beneath, reached by broad flights of steps from the nave. Sta. Maria della Pieve at Arezzo (ninth-eleventh century), **S. Ambrogio** at Milan (tenth-eleventh centuries), **S. Michele** at Pavia (late eleventh century), the **Cathedral of Piacenza** (1122), and **S. Zeno** at Verona (1139) are notable monuments of this style.



FIG. 93.—WEST FRONT AND CAMPANILE OF CATHEDRAL, PIACENZA.

LOMBARD EXTERIORS. The simple exteriors of the Lombard churches were usually effective and well composed. Slender colonnettes or long pilasters, blind arcades, and open arcaded galleries under the eaves gave light and shade to these exteriors. The façades were mere frontispieces with usually a single broad gable, the three aisles of the church being merely suggested by flat or round pilasters dividing the front (Fig. 93). Gabled porches, with columns resting on the backs of lions or monsters, adorned the doorways. The carving was often of a fierce and grotesque character. Detached bell-towers or *campaniles* adjoined many of these churches; square and simple in mass, but with well-dis-

tributed openings and well-proportioned belfries (Piacenza, Fig. 93; S. Zeno at Verona, etc.).

THE TUSCAN ROMANESQUE. The churches of this style (sometimes called the **Pisan**) were less vigorous but more elegant in design than the Lombard. They were basilicas in plan, with timber ceilings and high clearstories on columnar arcades. In

FIG. 94—BAPTISTERY, CATHEDRAL, AND LEANING TOWER, PISA.

their external decoration they betray the influence of Byzantine traditions, especially in the use of white and colored marble in alternating bands or in panelled veneering. Still more striking are the external wall-arcades sometimes occupying the whole height of the wall and carried on flat pilasters, sometimes in superposed stages of small arches on slender columns standing free of the wall. In general the decorative element prevailed over the constructive in the design of these picturesquely beautiful churches,

some of which are of noble size. The **Duomo** (cathedral) of **Pisa,** built 1063–1118, is the finest monument of the style (Figs. 94, 95). It is 312 feet long and 118 wide, with long transepts and an elliptical dome of later date over the *crossing* (the intersection of nave and transepts). Its richly arcaded front and banded flanks strikingly exemplify the illogical and unconstructive but highly decorative methods of the Tuscan Romanesque

FIG. 95.—INTERIOR OF PISA CATHEDRAL.

builders. The circular **Baptistery** (1153), with its lofty domical central hall surrounded by an aisle in two stories, and the famous **Leaning Tower** (1174), both designed with external arcading, combine with the Duomo to form the most remarkable group of ecclesiastical buildings in Italy, if not in Europe (Fig. 94).

The same style appears in more flamboyant shape in some of the churches of Lucca. The cathedral **S. Martino** (1060; façade, 1204; nave altered in fourteenth century) is the finest and largest of these; **S. Michele** (façade, 1288) and S. Frediano

(twelfth century) have the most elaborately decorated façades. The same principles of design appear in the cathedral and several other churches in Pistoia and Prato; but these belong, for the most part, to the Gothic period.

FLORENCE. The church of **S. Miniato,** near Florence (1013–60), shows a modification of the Pisan style. It is in plan a basilica with the nave divided into three parts by two transverse arches, carrying a richly painted timber roof, resembling that of Messina Cathedral.* The interior is embellished with encrusted patterns in black and white marble. The exterior is adorned with wall-arches and with panelled veneering in white and dark marble, instead of the horizontal bands of the Pisan churches, a blending of Pisan and Italo-Byzantine methods. The **Baptistery** of Florence, originally the cathedral, an imposing polygonal domical edifice of the tenth century, presents externally one of the most admirable examples of this practice. Its marble veneering in black and white, with pilasters and arches of excellent design, attributed by Vasari to Arnolfo di Cambio, is by many considered to be much older, although restored by that architect in 1294.

Suggestions of the Pisan arcade system are found in widely scattered examples in the east and south of Italy, mingled with features of Lombard and Byzantine design. In Apulia, as at Bari, Caserta Vecchia (1100), Molfetta (1192), and in Sicily, the Byzantine influence is conspicuous in the use of domes and in many of the decorative details. Particularly is this the case at Palermo and Monreale, where the churches erected after the Norman conquest—some of them domical, some basilican—show a strange but picturesque and beautiful mixture of Romanesque, Byzantine, and Arabic forms. The **Cathedrals** of **Monreale** and **Palermo** (1185) and the churches of the **Eremiti** and **La Martorana** at Palermo are the most important. The beautiful cloisters of the two cathedrals should be mentioned; also the

* Destroyed by the earthquake of December 28, 1908.

shameful disfigurement of the interior of Palermo Cathedral by Fuga in the eighteenth century.

The **Italo-Byzantine** style has already been treated in the latter part of Chapter XI.

CAMPANILES. The mediæval bell-towers of Italy are among the most striking features of the architecture of their period. They were invariably isolated structures, usually square in plan and without spires. The earliest appear to be those adjoining the two churches of San Apollinare in and near Ravenna (see p. 115), and date presumably from the sixth century. They are plain circular towers with few and small openings, except in the uppermost story, where larger arched openings permit the issue of the sound of the bells. It was at Rome, and not till the ninth or tenth century, that the campanile became a recognized feature of church architecture. The Roman campanile was built of brick upon a square plan, rising with little or no architectural adornment to a height usually of a hundred feet or more, and furnished with but a few small openings below the belfry stage, where a pair of coupled arched windows separated by a simple column opened from each face of the tower. Above these windows a low pyramidal roof terminated the tower. The towers of Sta. Maria in Cosmedin, Sta. Maria in Trastevere, and S. Giorgio in Velabro are examples of this type. Most of the Roman examples date from the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

In other cities, the campanile was treated with some variety of form and decoration, as well as of material. In Lombardy and Venetia the square red-brick shaft of the tower is often adorned with long, narrow pilaster strips and an arcaded cornice, as at Piacenza (p. 159, Fig. 93) and Venice. The openings at the top may be three or four in number on each face, and the plan is sometimes octagonal. The brick octagonal campanile of **S. Gottardo** at Milan is one of the finest Lombard church towers. At Verona the brick tower on the Piazza dell' Erbe and that of S. Zeno are conspicuous and at Pomposa, Torcello, Milan (S. Am-

brogio, S. Satiro), Padua, Modena, and Como are other interesting examples; but every important town of northern Italy possesses one or more examples of these structures dating from the eleventh, twelfth, or thirteenth century.

Undoubtedly the three most noted bell-towers in Italy are those of Venice, Pisa, and Florence. The great **Campanile** of **St. Mark** at Venice, first begun in 874, carried higher in the twelfth and fourteenth centuries, and finally completed in the sixteenth century with the marble belvedere and wooden spire so familiar in pictures of Venice, was formerly the highest in Italy, measuring approximately 325 feet to the summit. This superb historic monument which fell in sudden ruin in 1902 is now being slowly rebuilt on the original design. The **Leaning Tower** of Pisa (see p. 160, Fig. 94) dates from 1174, and is unique in its plan and its exterior treatment with superposed arcades. Begun apparently as a leaning tower, it seems to have increased this lean to a dangerous point, by the settling of its foundations during construction, as its upper stages were made to deviate slightly towards the vertical from the inclination of the lower portion. It has always served rather as a watch-tower and belvedere than as a bell-tower. The **Campanile** adjoining the Duomo at **Florence** and other notable towers of the Gothic period are described in Chapter XIX.

WESTERN ROMANESQUE ARCHITECTURE. In Western Europe the unrest and lawlessness which attended the unsettled relations of society under the feudal system long retarded the establishment of that social order without which architectural progress is impossible. With the eleventh century there began, however, a great activity in building, principally among the monasteries, which represented all that there was of culture and stability amid the prevailing disorder. Undisturbed by war, the only abodes of peaceful labor, learning, and piety, they had become rich and powerful, both in men and land. Probably the more or less general apprehension of the supposed impending end of the

world in the year 1000 contributed to this result by driving unquiet consciences to seek refuge in the monasteries, or to endow them richly.

The monastic builders, with little technical training, but with plenty of willing hands, sought out new architectural paths to meet their special needs. Remote from classic and Byzantine models, and mainly dependent on their own resources, they often failed to realize the intended results. But skill came with experience, and with advancing civilization and a surer mastery of construction came a finer taste and greater elegance of design. Meanwhile military architecture developed a new science of building, and covered Europe with imposing castles, admirably constructed and often artistic in design as far as military exigencies would permit.

CHARACTER OF THE STYLE. The Romanesque architecture of the eleventh and twelfth centuries in Western Europe (sometimes called the **Round-Arched Gothic**) was thus predominantly though not exclusively monastic. This gave it a certain unity of character in spite of national and local variations. The problem which the wealthy orders set themselves was, like that of the Lombard church-builders in Italy, to adapt the basilica plan to the exigencies of vaulted construction. Massive walls, round arches stepped or recessed to lighten their appearance, heavy mouldings richly carved, clustered piers and jamb-shafts, capitals either of the *cushion* type or imitated from the Corinthian, and strong and effective carving in which the influence of Byzantine ivories and MSS. illuminations is clearly discernible—all these are features alike of French, German, English, and Spanish Romanesque architecture.

THE FRENCH ROMANESQUE. Though monasticism produced remarkable results in France, architecture there did not wholly depend upon the monasteries. Southern Gaul (Provence) was full of classic remains and classic traditions, while at the same time it maintained close trade relations with Venice and the

East.* The domical cathedral of **Cahors** (1050–1100), an obvious imitation of S. Irene at Constantinople, and the later Cathedral of **Angoulême** (1119) display a notable advance in architectural skill outside of the monasteries. The church of **St. Front** at Perigueux, built in 1120, reproduced the plan of St. Mark's without its rich decoration, and with pointed instead of round arches (Figs. 96, 97). Among the abbeys, **Fontevrault** (1101–1119) closely resembles Angoulême, but surpasses it in the elegance of its choir and chapels. In these and a number of other domical churches of the same Franco-Byzantine type in Aquitania, the substitution of the Latin cross in the plan for the Greek cross used in St. Front, evinces the Gallic tendency to work out to their logical end new ideas or new applications of old ones. These striking variations on Byzantine themes might have developed into an independent local style but for the overwhelming tide of Gothic influence which later poured in from the North.



FIG. 96.—PLAN OF ST. FRONT.

Meanwhile, farther south (at Arles, Avignon, etc.), classic models strongly influenced the details, if not the plans, of an interesting series of churches remarkable especially for their porches rich with figure sculpture and for their elaborately carved details. The classic archivolt, the Corinthian capital, the Roman forms of enriched mouldings, are evident at a glance in the porches of Notre Dame des Doms at Avignon, of the church of **St. Gilles**

* See Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire raisonné,* article ARCHITECTURE, vol. i., pp. 66 *et seq.*; also Enlart, *Manuel d'archéologie française,* i., pp. 210-212, 284-286.

and of **St. Trophime** at Arles.

FIG. 97.—INTERIOR OF ST. FRONT, PERIGUEUX.
In its original form.

DEVELOPMENT OF VAULTING. It was in Central France, and mainly along the Loire, that the systematic development of vaulted church architecture began. Naves covered with barrel-vaults, sometimes of pointed section, appear in a number of large churches built during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, with apsidal and transeptal chapels and aisles carried around the apse, as in St. Étienne, Nevers, **Notre Dame du Port** at Clermont-Ferrand (Figs. 98, 99), **St. Paul** at Issoire, and in the imposing church of **St. Sernin** at Toulouse, in Provence (Fig. 100). The thrust of these ponderous vaults was clumsily resisted by half-barrel vaults over the side-aisles, transmitting the strain to massive side-walls (Fig. 99), or by high side-aisles with transverse barrel or groined vaults over each bay. In either case the clearstory was suppressed—a fact which mattered little in the sunny southern provinces. In the more cloudy North, in Normandy, Picardy, and the Royal Domain, the nave-vault was raised higher to admit of clearstory windows. But these eleventh-



FIG. 98.—PLAN OF NOTRE DAME DU PORT, CLERMONT.

century vaults nearly all fell in, and had to be reconstructed on new principles. In this work the Clunisians seem to have led the way, as at **Cluny** (1089) and **Vézelay** (1100). In the latter church, one of the finest and most interesting French edifices of the twelfth century, a groined vault replaced the barrel-vault, though the oblong plan of the vaulting-bays, due to the nave being wider than the pier-arches, led to somewhat awkward twisted surfaces in the vaulting. But even here the vaults had insufficient lateral buttressing, and began to crack and settle; so that in the great ante-chapel, built thirty years later, the side-aisles were made in two stories, the better to resist the thrust, and the groined vaults themselves were constructed of pointed section. These seem to be the earliest pointed groined vaults in France. It was not till the second half of that century, however, that the flying buttress was combined with such vaults, so as to permit of high clearstories for the better lighting of the nave; and the



FIG. 99.—SECTION OF NOTRE DAME DU PORT, CLERMONT.



FIG 100.—PLAN OF ST. SERNIN, TOULOUSE.

problem of satisfactorily vaulting an oblong space with a groined vault was not solved until the following century.*

ONE-AISLED CHURCHES. In the Franco-Byzantine churches already described (p. 166) this difficulty of the oblong vaulting-bay did not occur, owing to the absence of side-aisles and pier-arches. Following this conception of church-planning, a number of interesting parish churches and a few cathedrals were built in various parts of France in which side-recesses or chapels took the place of side-aisles. The partitions separating them served as abutments for the groined or barrel-vaults of the nave. The cathedrals of **Autun** (1150) and **Langres** (1160), and in the fourteenth century that of Alby, employed this arrangement, common in many earlier Provençal churches which have disappeared.



FIG. 101.—A SIX-PART RIBBED VAULT, SHOWING TWO COMPARTMENTS WITH THE FILLINGS COMPLETE.

a, a, Transverse ribs (doubleaux); b, b, Wall-ribs (formerets); c, c, Groin-ribs (diagonaux).

(All the ribs are semicircles.)

SIX-PART VAULTING. In the Royal Domain great architectural activity does not appear to have begun until the beginning of the Gothic period in the middle of the twelfth century. But in Normandy, and especially at Caen and Mont St. Michel, there were produced, between 1046 and 1120, some remarkable churches, in which a high clearstory was secured in conjunction with a vaulted nave, by the use of "six-part" vaulting (Fig. 101). This was an awkward expedient, by which a square vaulting-bay was divided into six parts by the groins and by a middle trans-

* See Introduction to Chapter XV.

verse rib, necessitating two narrow skew vaults meeting at the centre. Two of these relatively narrow side-aisle bays were thus grouped under one vaulting-bay, avoiding the oblong vault-bay occurring at Vézelay. This unsatisfactory device was retained for over a century, occuring frequently in early Gothic churches in France, and occasionally in Great Britain. It made it possible to resist the thrust by high side-aisles, and yet to open windows above these under the cross-vaults. The abbey churches of **St. Étienne** (the Abbaye aux Hommes) and **Ste. Trinité** (Abbaye aux Dames), at Caen, built in the time of William the Conqueror, were among the most magnificent churches of their time, both in size and in the excellence and ingenuity of their construction. The great abbey church of **Mont St. Michel** (much altered in later times) should also be mentioned here. At the same time these and other Norman churches showed a great advance in their internal composition. A well-developed triforium or subordinate gallery was introduced between the pier-arches and clearstory, and all the structural membering of the edifice was better proportioned and more logically expressed than in most contemporary work.

ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS. The details of French Romanesque architecture varied considerably in the several provinces, according as classic, Byzantine, or local influences prevailed. Except in a few of the Aquitanian churches, the round arch was universal. The walls were heavy and built of rubble between facings of stones of moderate size dressed with the axe. Windows and doors were widely splayed to diminish the obstruction of the massive walls, and were treated with jamb-shafts and recessed arches. These were usually formed with large cylindrical mouldings, richly carved with leaf ornaments, zigzags, billets, and grotesques. Figure-sculpture was more generally used in the South than in the North. The interior piers were sometimes cylindrical, but more often clustered, and where square bays of four-part or six-part vaulting were employed, the piers were alter-

nately lighter and heavier. Each shaft nad its independent capital either of the block type or of a form resembling somewhat that of the Corinthian order. During the eleventh century it became customary to carry up to the main vaulting one or more shafts of the compound pier to support the vaulting ribs. Thus the division of the nave into *bays* was accentuated, while at the same time the horizontal three-fold division of the height by a well-defined triforium between the pier-arches and clearstory began to be likewise emphasized.

VAULTING. The vaulting was also divided into bays by transverse ribs, and where it was groined the groins themselves began in the twelfth century to be marked by groin-ribs.* These were constructed independently of the vaulting, and the four or six compartments of each vaulting-bay were then built in, the ribs serving, in part at least, to support the centrings for this purpose. This far-reaching principle, already applied by the Romans in their concrete vaults (see p. 84), appears as a re-discovery, or rather an independent invention, of the builders of Normandy at the close of the eleventh century. The flying buttress was a later invention; in the round-arched buildings of the eleventh and twelfth centuries the buttressing was mainly internal, and was incomplete and timid in its arrangement.

EXTERIORS. The exteriors were on this account plain and flat. The windows were small, the mouldings simple, and towers were rarely combined with the body of the church until after the beginning of the twelfth century. Then they appeared as mere belfries of moderate height, with pyramidal roofs and effectively arranged openings, the germs of the noble Gothic spires of later times. Externally the western porches and portals were the most important features of the design, producing an imposing effect by their massive arches, clustered piers, richly carved mouldings, and deep shadows.

*As had been earlier done in Lombard architecture in S. Ambrogio, Milan.

CLOISTERS, ETC. Mention should be made of the other monastic buildings which were grouped around the abbey churches of this period. These comprised refectories, chapter-halls, cloistered courts surrounded by the conventual cells, and a large number of accessory structures for kitchens, infirmaries, stores, etc. The whole formed an elaborate and complex aggregation of connected buildings, often of great size and beauty, especially the refectories and cloisters. Most of these conventual buildings have disappeared, many of them having been demolished during the Gothic period to make way for more elegant structures in the new style. There remain, however, a number of fine cloistered courts in their original form, especially in Southern France. Among the most remarkable of these are those of **Moissac, Elne,** and **Montmajour.**

MONUMENTS. Italy. (For basilicas and domical churches of 6th-12th centuries see pp. 118, 119.)—Before 11th century: Sta. Maria at Toscanella, altered 1206; S. Donato, Zara; chapel at Friuli; baptisteries at Biella, Albenga, Asti, Galliano; Rotondo at Brescia; S. Michele in Monte, Pola, 997. 11th century: S. Abbondio, Como, 1013; SS. Pietro e Paolo, Bologna, 1014; Duomo at Novara, 1020; S. Giovanni, Viterbo; Sta. Maria della Pieve, Arezzo; S. Antonio, Piacenza, 1014; S. Ambrogio, Milan, 9th-11th century; Duomo at Bari, 1027 (much altered); Duomo and baptistery, Novara, 1030; Duomo at Parma, begun 1058; Duomo at Pisa, 1063-1118; S. Miniato, Florence, 1063-12th century; S. Michele at Pavia, 10th-11th century, vault rebuilt 16th century; Duomo at Modena, late 11th century.—12th century: in Calabria and Apulia, cathedrals of Trani, 1100; Caserta Vecchia, 1100-1153; Molfetta, 1162; Benevento; churches S. Giovanni at Brindisi, S. Niccolo at Bari, 1139. In Sicily, Eremiti, 1132, and La Martorana, 1143, both at Palermo; Duomo at Monreale; Duomo at Palermo, 1174-1189; Duomo at Messina; Duomo at Cefalù, 1131-48. In Northern Italy, S. Tomaso in Limine, Bergamo, 1100 (?); Duomo at Cremona, 1107-90; Parma, 1117; Sta. Giulia, Brescia; S. Lorenzo, Milan, rebuilt 1119; Duomo at Piacenza, 1122; S. Zeno at Verona, 1139; baptistery at Pisa, 1153-1278; Leaning Tower, Pisa, 1174; S. Michele, Lucca, 1188; S. Giovanni and S. Frediano, Lucca. In

Dalmatia, cathedral at Zara, 1192-1204. Many castles and early town-halls, as at Bari, Brescia, Lucca, etc.

France: Previous to 11th century: Bapt. St. Jean, Poitiers, Chapel St. Laurent, Grenoble; Crypts at Jouarre and Poitiers, all 7th century; St. Germiny-des-Prés, 806; Chapel of the Trinity, St. Honorat-des-Lérins; Ste. Croix de Montmajour.—11th century: St. Germain-des-Prés, Paris, 1014; vault, choir later; St. Philibert, Tournus, 1009-19; Conques, 1035; Cérisy-la-Forêt and abbey church of Mont St. Michel, 1020 (the latter altered in 12th and 16th centuries; Vignory; St. Genou; Jumièges; Montiérender; porch of St. Benoît-sur-Loire, 1030; St. Sépulchre at Neuvy, 1045; Ste. Trinité (Abbaye aux Dames) at Caen, 1046, vaulted 1140; St. Etienne (Abbaye aux Hommes) at Caen, same date; St. Etienne, Névers, 1063; Ste. Croix at Quimperlé, 1081; cathedral, Cahors, 1119; abbey churches of Cluny (demolished) and Vézelay, 1089-1100; circular church of Rieux-Mérinville, church of St. Savin in Auvergne, the churches of St. Paul at Issoire and Notre-Dame-du-Port at Clermont, St. Hilaire, Ste. Radégonde and Notre-Dame-la-Grande at Poitiers, all at close of 11th and beginning of 12th century. Many crypts under later churches.—12th century: Cath. Autun, 1120-32; domical churches of Aquitania and vicinity; Solignac and Fontevrault, 1120; St. Front at Perigueux, 1120; St. Etienne (Périgueux), St. Avit-Sénieur; Angoulême, 1105-28; Souillac, Broussac, etc., early 12th century. St. Trophime at Arles, 1110, cloisters later; St. Gilles, 1116; church of Vaison; abbeys and cloisters at Montmajour, Tarascon, Moissac (with fragments of a 10th-century cloister built into present arcades); St. Paul-du-Mausolée; Puy-en-Vélay, with fine church; St. Maurice, Angers; La Trinité, Laval; Paray-le-Monial; Notre Dame de la Coulture; Notre Dame des Doms, Avignon; St. Eutrope, Saintes; St. Ours, Loches, 1165; St. Saturnin (Sernin) at Toulouse (original church, 1060-96; rebuilt 12th century; nave rebuilt 14th century on old design). Many other abbeys, parish churches, and a few cathedrals in Central and Northern France especially.

CHAPTER XIV.

EARLY MEDIÆVAL ARCHITECTURE.—*Continued.*

IN GERMANY, GREAT BRITAIN, AND SPAIN.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: As before, Hübsch and Reber. Also Bond, *Gothic Architecture in England.* Brandon, *Analysis of Gothic Architecture.* Boisserée, *Nieder Rhein.* Ditchfield, *The Cathedrals of England.* Förster, *Denkmäler deutscher Baukunst.* Hasak, *Die romanische und die gotische Baukunst* (in *Handbuch d. Arch.*). Lübke, *Die Mittelälterliche Kunst in Westfalen.* Möller, *Denkmäler der deutschen Baukunst.* Otte, *Geschichte der romanischen Baukunst in Deutschland.* Puttrich, *Baukunst des Mittelalters in Sachsen.* Rickman, *An Attempt to Discriminate the Styles of Architecture.* Ross and McGibbon, *Ecclesiastical Architecture of Scotland.* Scott, *English Church Architecture.* Van Rensselaer, *English Cathedrals.*

MEDIÆVAL GERMANY. Architecture developed less rapidly and symmetrically in Germany than in France. The unwieldy dominion known as the "Holy Roman Empire" was ruled over successively by the Saxon, Franconian and Suabian lines, but without establishing real political unity in its vast territory. Only in the Rhine valley were the conditions early favorable to progress in the arts. The early churches were of wood, and the substitution of stone for wood proceeded slowly. During the Carolingian epoch (800–919), however, a few important buildings had been erected, embodying Byzantine and classic traditions. Among these the most notable was the **Minster** or palatine chapel of Charlemagne at **Aix-la-Chapelle,** an obvious imitation of San Vitale at Ravenna. It consisted of an octagonal domed hall sur-

rounded by a vaulted aisle in two stories, but without the eight niches of the Ravenna plan. It was preceded by a porch flanked by turrets. The Byzantine type thus introduced was repeated in later churches, as in the Nuns' Choir at Essen (947) and at Ottmarsheim (1050). In the great monastery at Fulda a basilica with transepts and with an apsidal choir at either end was built in 803. These choirs were raised above the level of the nave, to admit of crypts beneath them, as in many Lombard churches; a practice which, with the reduplication of the choir and apse just mentioned, became very common in German Romanesque architecture.

EARLY CHURCHES. It was in Saxony that this architecture first entered upon a truly national development. The early churches of this province and of Hildesheim (where architecture flourished under the favor of the bishops, as elsewhere under the royal influence) were of basilican plan and destitute of vaulting, except in the crypts. They were built with massive piers, sometimes rectangular, sometimes clustered, the two kinds often alternating in the same nave. Short columns were, however, sometimes used instead of piers, either alone, as at Paulinzelle and Limburg-on-the-Hardt (1024–39), or alternating with piers, as at Hecklingen, **Gernrode** (958–1050), and **St. Godehard** at Hildesheim (1033). A triple eastern apse, with apsidal chapels projecting eastward from the transepts were common elements in the plans, and a second apse, choir, and crypt at the west end were not infrequent. Externally the most striking feature was the association of two, four, or even six square or circular towers with the mass of the church, and the elevation of square or polygonal turrets or cupolas over the crossing. These gave a very picturesque aspect to edifices otherwise somewhat wanting in artistic interest.



FIG. 102.—PLAN OF MINSTER AT WORMS.

RHENISH CHURCHES. It was in the Rhine provinces that vaulting was first applied to the naves of German churches, nearly a half century after its general adoption in France. Cologne possesses an interesting trio of churches in which the Lombard dome on squinches or on pendentives, with three apses or niches opening into the central area, was associated with a long three-aisled nave (**St. Mary-in-the-Capitol,** begun in ninth century; **Great St. Martin's,** 1150–70; **Apostles' Church,** 1160–99: the naves vaulted later). The double chapel at **Schwarz-Rheindorf,** near Bonn (1151), also has the crossing covered by a dome on pendentives. The Lombard influence is also clearly manifest in many external details of these Rhenish churches.

FIG. 103.—ONE BAY OF CATHEDRAL AT SPIRES.

The vaulting of the nave itself was developed in another series of edifices of imposing size, the cathedrals of **Mayence** (1036) **Spires** (Speyer), the cathedral-mausoleum of the Franconian, Hohenstaufen and earlier Hapsburg emperors, and **Worms,** and the **Abbey of Laach,** all built in the eleventh century and vaulted early in the twelfth. In the first three the main vaulting is in square bays, each covering two bays of the nave, the piers of which are alternately lighter and heavier (Figs. 102, 103). There was no triforium gallery, and stability was secured only by excessive thickness in the piers and clear-story walls, and by bringing down the main vault as near to the side-aisle roofs as possible.

RHENISH EXTERIORS. These great churches, together with those of **Bonn** and **Limburg-on-the-Lahn** and the cathedral of **Treves** (Trier, 1047), are interesting, not only by their size and dignity of plan and the somewhat rude massiveness of their construction, but even more so by the picturesqueness of their external design (Fig. 104). Especially successful is the massing of the large and small turrets with the lofty nave-roof and with the apses at one or both ends. The arcading upon the exterior walls, and the open arcaded dwarf galleries under the cornices of the apses, gables, and dome-turrets gave to these Rhenish churches an external beauty hardly equalled in other contemporary edifices. This method of exterior design, and the system of vaulting in square bays over double bays of the nave, were probably derived from the Lombard churches of Northern Italy, with which the German emperors had many political relations.

FIG. 104.—EAST END OF CHURCH OF THE APOSTLES, COLOGNE.

The Italian influence is also encountered in a number of circular churches of early date, as at Fulda (ninth-eleventh century), Drügelte, Bonn (baptistery, demolished), and in façades like that at Rosheim, which is a copy in little of San Zeno at Verona.

Elsewhere in Germany architecture was in a backward state, especially in the southern duchies. Outside of Saxony, Franco-

nia, and the Rhine provinces, very few works of importance were erected until the thirteenth century.

SECULAR ARCHITECTURE. Little remains to us of the secular architecture of this period in Germany, if we except the great feudal castles, especially those of the Rhine, which were, after all, rather works of military engineering than of architectural art. The palace of Charlemagne at Aix (the chapel of which was mentioned on p. 174) is known to have been a vast and splendid group of buildings, partly, at least of marble; but hardly a vestige of it remains. Of the extensive **Kaiserburg** at **Goslar** there remain well-defined ruins of an imposing hall of assembly in two aisles with triple-arched windows. At Brunswick the east wing of the **Burg Dankwarderode** displays, in spite of modern alterations, the arrangement of the chapel, great hall, two fortified towers, and part of the residence of Henry the Lion. The **Wartburg** palace of Duke Ludwig III. (*cir.* 1150) is more generally known—a three-storied hall with windows effectively grouped to form arcades (upper part modern); while at Gelnhausen and Münzenberg are ruins of somewhat similar buildings. A few of the Romanesque monasteries of Germany have left partial remains, as at **Maulbronn,** which was almost entirely rebuilt in the Gothic period, and isolated buildings in Cologne and elsewhere. There remain also in Cologne a number of Romanesque private houses with coupled windows and stepped gables.

GREAT BRITAIN. Previous to the Norman conquest (1066) there was in the British Isles little or no architecture worthy of mention. The few extant remains of Saxon and Celtic buildings reveal a singular poverty of ideas and want of technical skill. These scanty remains are mostly of towers (those in Ireland nearly all round and tapering, with conical tops, their use and date being the subjects of much controversy) and crypts. The tower of Earl's Barton is the most important and best preserved of those in England. With the Norman conquest, however, began an extraordinary activity in the building of churches and abbeys.

William the Conqueror himself founded a number of these, and his Norman ecclesiastics endeavored to surpass on British soil the contemporary churches of Normandy. The new churches differed somewhat from their French prototypes; they were narrower and lower, but much longer, especially as to the choir and transepts. The cathedrals of **Durham** (1096–1133) and **Norwich** (same date) are important examples (Fig. 105). They also differed from the French churches in two important particulars externally; a huge tower rose usually over the crossing, and the western portals were small and insignificant. Lateral entrances near the west end were given greater importance and called *Galilees*. At Durham a Galilee chapel (not shown in the plan) takes the place of a porch at the west end, like the ante-churches of St. Benoît-sur-Loire and Vézelay.



FIG. 105.—PLAN OF DURHAM CATHEDRAL.*

THE NORMAN STYLE. The Anglo-Norman builders employed the same general features as the Romanesque builders of Normandy, but with more of picturesqueness and less of refinement and technical elegance. Heavy walls, recessed arches, round mouldings, cubic cushion-caps, clustered piers, and in doorways a jamb-shaft for each stepping of the arch were common to both styles. But in England the Cor-

* The transept-like eastern termination, known as the Nine Altars, is a Gothic addition of 1242. The original east end was a plain apse.

inthian form of capital is rare, its place being taken by simpler forms.

NORMAN INTERIORS. The interior design of the larger churches of this period shows a close general analogy to contemporaneous French Norman churches, as appears by comparing the nave of Waltham or Peterboro' with that of Cérisy-la-Forêt, in Normandy. Although the massiveness of the Anglo-Norman piers and walls plainly suggests the intention of vaulting the nave, this intention seems never to have been carried out except in small churches and crypts. All the existing abbeys and cathedrals of this period had wooden ceilings or were, like Tewkesbury, Norwich, and Gloucester, vaulted at a later date. Completed as they were with wooden nave-roofs, the clearstory was, without danger, made quite lofty and furnished with windows of considerable size. These were placed near the outside of the thick wall, and a passage was left between them and a triple arch on the inner face of the wall—a device imitated from the abbeys at Caen. The vaulted side-aisles were low, with heavy ribs and wide pier-arches, above which was a high triforium gallery under the side-roofs. Thus a nearly equal height was assigned to each of the three stories of the bay, disregarding that subordination of minor to major parts which gives interest to an architectural composition. The piers were quite often round, as at Gloucester, Hereford, Southwell, and Bristol cathedrals and Shrewsbury Abbey. Sometimes round piers alternated with clustered piers, as at Durham and Waltham; and in some cases clustered piers alone were employed, as at Peterboro', Norwich, and Winchester transepts (Fig. 106).



FIG. 106.—ONE BAY OF TRANSEPT, WINCHESTER CATHEDRAL.

FAÇADES AND DOORWAYS. All the details were of the simplest character, except in the doorways. These were richly adorned with clustered jamb-shafts and elaborately carved mouldings, but there was little variety in the details of this carving. The zigzag was the most common feature, though birds' heads with the beaks pointing toward the centre of the arch were not uncommon. In the smaller chuches (Fig. 107) the doorways were better proportioned to the whole façade than in the larger ones, in which they appear as relatively insignificant features. Very few examples remain of important Norman façades in their original form, nearly all of these having been altered after the round arch was displaced by the pointed arch in the latter part of the twelfth century. Iffley church (Fig. 107) is a good example of the style.



FIG. 107.—FRONT OF IFFLEY CHURCH.

SCOTLAND possesses many churches of this period, but nearly all were ruined or injured in the Border wars, and few of these rebuilt. They exhibit a provincial character, many years behind the English developments, but are often extremely picturesque. **Jedburgh Abbey** is the finest of them; Kelso and Iona may also be mentioned.

SPAIN. The capture of Toledo, in 1062, from the Moors, began the gradual emancipation of the country from Moslem rule, and in the northern provinces a number of important churches were erected under the influence of French Romanesque models. The use of domical pendentives (as in the **Panteon** of S. Isi-

doro, at Leon, and in the *cimborio* or dome over the choir at the crossing in old Salamanca cathedral) was probably derived from the domical churches of Aquitania and Anjou. Elsewhere the northern Romanesque type prevailed under various modifications, with long nave and transepts, a short choir, and a complete *chevet* with apsidal chapels. The church of **St. Iago** at Compostella (1078) is the finest example of this class. These churches nearly all had groined vaulting over the side-aisles and barrel-vaults over the nave, the constructive system being substantially that of the churches of Auvergne and the Loire Valley (p. 167). They differed, however, in the treatment of the crossing of nave and transepts, over which was usually erected a dome or cupola on pendentives or squinches, covered externally by an imposing square lantern or tower, as in the **Old Cathedral** at **Salamanca,** already mentioned (1120–78) and the **Collegiate Church** at **Toro.** Occasional exceptions to these types are met with, as in the basilican wooden-roofed church of S. Millan at Segovia; in **S. Isidoro** at Leon, with chapels and a later-added square eastern end, and the circular church of the Templars at Segovia.

The architectural details of these Spanish churches did not differ radically from contemporary French work. As in France and England, the doorways were the most ornate parts of the design, the mouldings being carved with extreme richness and the jambs frequently adorned with statues, as in **S. Vincente** at Avila. There was no such logical and reasoned-out system of external design as in France, and there is consequently greater variety in the façades. Perhaps the most remarkable thing about the architecture of this period is its apparent exemption from the influence of the Moorish monuments which abounded on every hand. This may be explained by the hatred which was felt by the Christians for the Moslems and all their works.

MONUMENTS. GERMANY: Previous to 11th century: Circular churches of Holy Cross at Münster, and of Fulda; palace chapel

of Charlemagne at Aix-la-Chapelle, 804; St. Stephen, Mayence, 990; primitive nave and crypt of St. Gereon, Cologne, 10th century; Lorsch.—11th century: Churches of Gernrode, Goslar, and Merseburg in Saxony; cathedral of Bremen; first restoration of cathedral of Treves (Trier), 1010, west front, 1047; Limburg-on-Hardt, 1024; St. Willibrod, Echternach, 1031; St. Godehard, Hildesheim, 1033; east end of Mayence Cathedral, 1036; Church of Apostles and nave of St. Mary-in-Capitol at Cologne, 1036; Minster at Hersfeld, 1038; cathedral of Spires (Speyer) begun 1040; Cathedral Hildesheim, 1061; St. Michael, Hildesheim, 1062; St. James, Cologne, 1067; St. Joseph, Bamberg, 1073; Abbey of Laach, 1093-1156; round churches of Bonn, Drügelte, Nimeguen; cathedrals of Paderborn and Minden.—12th century: Churches of Klus, Paulinzelle, Hamersleben, 1100-1110; Johannisberg, 1130; Worms, the Minster, 1118-83; Jerichau, 1144-60; Abbey Maulbroun, 1146-73; Great St. Martin's, Cologne, 1150-1200; Schwarz-Rheindorf, 1151; Cathedral Brunswick, 1172-94; Lübeck, 1172; also churches of Gaudersheim, Hecklingen, Würzburg, St. Matthew at Treves, Limburg-on-Lahn, Sinzig, St. Castor at Coblentz, Diesdorf, Rosheim; round churches of Ottmarsheim and Rippen (Denmark); cathedral of Basle, cathedral and cloister of Zurich (Switzerland).

England: Previous to 11th century: Scanty vestiges of Saxon church architecture, as tower of Earl's Barton, nave of Higham Ferrers, round towers and small chapels in Ireland.—11th century: Crypt of Canterbury Cathedral, 1070; chapel St. John in Tower of London, 1070; Winchester Cathedral, 1076-93 (nave and choir rebuilt later); St. Alban's Abbey, 1077-1115 (partly remodelled later); Shrewsbury Abbey, 1083; Tewkesbury Abbey, 1087-1123 (vaulted later); Gloucester Cathedral nave, 1089-1100 (vaulted later); Rochester Cathedral nave, west front, cloisters, and chapter-house, 1090-1130; Chichester Cathedral, 1091-1148 (vaulting, transept, cloisters, spires, later); Carlisle Cathedral nave, transepts, 1093-1130; Durham Cathedral, 1095-1133 (Galilee and chapter-house, 1133-53; "Nine Altars," 1242); Norwich Cathedral, 1096, largely rebuilt 1118-93; Hereford Cathedral, nave and choir, 1099-1110 (vaulted later).—12th century: Ely Cathedral, nave, 1107-33; Southwell Cathedral, 1108-35 (choir rebuilt later); Peterboro' Cathedral, 1117-45; Waltham Abbey, early 12th century; Church of Holy Sepulchre, Cambridge, 1130-35; Worcester Cathedral chapter-house, 1140 (?); Oxford Cathedral

(Christ Church), 1150-80; Bristol Cathedral chapter-house (square), 1155; Canterbury Cathedral, choir of present structure by William of Sens, 1175; Romsey Abbey, late 12th century; St. Cross Hospital near Winchester, 1190 (?). Many more or less important parish churches in various parts of England.

Spain. For principal monuments of 9th-12th centuries, see text, latter part of this chapter.

CHAPTER XV.

GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: Adamy, *Architektonik des gotischen Stils.* Corroyer, *L'Architecture gothique.* Enlart, *Manuel d'archéologie française.* Gonse, *L'Art gothique.* Hasak, *Der Kirchenbau; Einzelheiten des Kirchenbaues; der Wohnbau.* (in *Hdbuch d. Arch.*). Moore, *Development and Character of Gothic Architecture.* Parker, *Introduction to Gothic Architecture; Glossary of Terms used in Gothic Architecture.* Porter, *Mediæval Architecture*, Vol. II. Scott, *Mediæval Architecture.* Viollet-le-Duc, *Discourses on Architecture; Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française.*

INTRODUCTORY. The architectural styles which were developed in Western Europe during the period extending from about 1150 to 1450 or 1500 received in an unscientific age the wholly erroneous name of Gothic. This has, however, become so fixed in common usage that it is hardly possible to substitute for it any more scientific designation. In reality the architecture to which it is applied was nothing more than the sequel and outgrowth of the Romanesque, which we have already studied. Its fundamental principles were the same; it was concerned with the same problems. These it took up where the Romanesque builders left them, and worked out their solution under new conditions, until it had developed out of the simple and massive models of the early twelfth century the splendid cathedrals of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in England, France, Germany, the Low Countries and Spain.

THE CHURCH AND ARCHITECTURE. The twelfth century was an era of widespread intellectual awakening, and of profound

economic, social and political changes. The revival of law and jurisprudence, the rise of vernacular literature, the growth of commerce and of the use of money, the beginnings of physical science based upon the Aristotelian philosophy, and the power and greatness attained by the church, mark the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as one of the great periods in the history of human progress. The ideas of Church and State were becoming more clearly defined in the common mind. The claims of human right were beginning to present themselves alongside of those of human might. The struggle for ascendency between the crown, the feudal barons, the pope, bishops, and abbots, in France, Germany, England, and other countries, presented itself in varied aspects, but the general outcome was essentially the same. The church began to appear as something behind and above abbots, bishops, kings, and barons. The supremacy of the papal authority gained increasing recognition, and the episcopacy began to overshadow the monastic institutions. The prerogatives of the crown became more firmly established, and thus the Church and the State emerged from the social confusion as the two institutions divinely appointed for the government of men.



FIG. 108.—CONSTRUCTIVE SYSTEM OF GOTHIC CHURCH. ILLUSTRATING PRINCIPLES OF ISOLATED SUPPORTS AND BUTTRESSING.

Under these influences ecclesiastical architecture advanced with rapid strides. No longer hampered by monastic restrictions, it

called into its service the laity, whose guilds of masons and builders carried from one diocese to another their constantly increasing stores of constructive knowledge. By a wise division of labor each man wrought only such parts as he was specially trained to undertake. The master-builder—bishop, abbot, or mason—seems to have planned only the general arrangement and scheme of the building, leaving the details to be worked out by each craftsman according to his own fancy, the traditions of his craft, or the special exigencies of each case. Thus was produced that remarkable variety in unity of the Gothic cathedrals; thus, also, those singular irregularities and makeshifts, those discrepancies and alterations in the design, which are found in every great work of mediæval architecture. Gothic architecture was constantly changing, attacking new problems or devising new solutions of old ones. In this character of constant flux and development it contrasts strongly with the classic styles, in which the scheme and the principles were early fixed and remained substantially unchanged for centuries.



FIG. 109.—PLAN OF SAINTE CHAPELLE, PARIS, SHOWING SUPPRESSION OF SIDE-WALLS.

STRUCTURAL PRINCIPLES. The pointed arch, so commonly regarded as the most characteristic feature of the Gothic styles, was merely an incidental feature of their development. It had long been used in the Orient, and occurs repeatedly in French Romanesque buildings. What was really distinctive of the Gothic architecture was the systematic application of two principles partially recognized by the Roman and Byzantine builders, but which seem to have been afterward forgotten until they were

revived by the later Romanesque architects. The first of these was the *concentration of strains* upon isolated points of support, made possible by the substitution of groined for barrel vaults. This led to a corresponding concentration of the masses of masonry at these points; the building was constructed as if upon legs (Fig. 108). The wall became a mere filling-in between the piers or buttresses, and in time was, indeed, practically suppressed, immense windows filled with stained glass taking its place. This is well illustrated in the **Sainte Chapelle** at Paris, built 1242–47 (Figs. 109, 124). In this remarkable edifice, a series of groined vaults spring from slender shafts built against deep buttresses which receive and resist all the thrusts. The wall-spaces between them are wholly occupied by superb windows filled with stone tracery and stained glass. It would be impossible to combine the materials used more scientifically or effectively. The cathedrals of Gerona (Spain) and of Alby (France; Fig. 126) illustrate the same principle, though in them the buttresses are internal and serve to separate the flanking chapels.

FIG. 110.—EARLY GOTHIC FLYING BUTTRESS.

The second distinctive principle of Gothic architecture was that of *transmitted thrusts*. In Roman buildings the thrust of the vaulting was resisted wholly by the inertia of mass in the abutments. In Gothic architecture thrusts were as far as possible resisted by counter-thrusts, and the final resultant pressure was transmitted by fly-

ing half-arches across the intervening portions of the structure to external buttresses placed at convenient points. This combination of flying half-arches and buttresses is called the *flying-buttress* (Fig. 110). It reached its highest development in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in the cathedrals of central and northern France, and is the one absolutely novel and distinctive feature of the style.

RIBBED VAULTING. These two principles formed the structural basis of the Gothic styles. Their application led to the introduction of two other elements, second only to them in importance, *ribbed vaulting* and the *pointed arch*.



FIG. 111. — RIBBED VAULT, ENGLISH TYPE WITH DIVIDED GROIN-RIBS AND RIDGE-RIBS.

The first of these resulted from the effort to overcome certain practical difficulties encountered in the building of large groined vaults. As ordinarily constructed, a groined vault like that in Fig. 47 must be built as one structure, upon wooden centrings supporting its whole extent. The Romanesque architects conceived the idea of constructing an independent skeleton of ribs.* Two of these were built against the wall (*wall-ribs*), two across the nave (transverse ribs); and two others were made to coincide with the groins (Figs. 101, 111). The *groin-ribs*, intersecting at the centre of the vault, divided each bay into four triangular portions, or *compartments*, each of which was really an independent vault which could be separately constructed upon light centrings supported by the groin-ribs themselves. This principle, though identical in essence with the Roman system of brick skeleton-ribs for concrete vaults, was, in application and detail, superior to it, both from the scientific and artistic point of view. The ribs,

* It is now generally believed that the earliest medieval vault thus constructed is the nave vault of S. Ambrogio at Milan (Fig. 91).

richly moulded, became, in the hands of the Gothic architects, important decorative features. In practice the builder gave to each set of ribs independently the curvature he desired. The vaulting-surfaces were then easily twisted or warped so as to fit the various ribs, which, being already in place, served as guides for their construction.



FIG. 112—PENETRATIONS AND INTERSECTIONS OF VAULTS.

a, a, Penetrations by small semicircular vaults sprung from same level. b, Intersection by small semicircular vault sprung from higher level; groins form wavy lines. c, Intersection by narrow pointed vault sprung from same level; groins are plane curves.

THE POINTED ARCH was adopted to remedy the difficulties encountered in the construction of oblong vaults. It is obvious that where a narrow semi-cylindrical vault intersects a wide one, it produces either what are called *penetrations*, as at *a* (Fig. 112), or intersections like that at *b*, both of which are awkward in aspect and hard to construct. If, however, one or both vaults be given a pointed section, the narrow vault may be made as high as the wide one. It is then possible, with but little warping of the vaulting surfaces, to make them intersect in groins *c*, which are vertical plane curves instead of wavy loops like *a* and *b*.

The Gothic architects availed themselves to the full of these two devices. The groin-ribs were commonly semicircular, but the wall-ribs and the transverse ribs were, without exception, pointed arches, with the apex of each nearly or quite at the level of the groin intersection. The pointed arch, thus introduced as the most convenient form for these ribs, was soon applied to other parts of the structure, especially the windows and pier-arches,

which would not otherwise fit well the wall-spaces under the wall-ribs of the nave and aisle vaulting.

This entire system of vaulting constituted the inner roof or stone ceiling of the church. But since it was impossible to make a vault of stone wholly weather proof, the exterior surface providing numerous pockets in which water, snow and ice were sure to gather, an external protective roof of wood, covered with tile, slate, copper or lead was always built over the vaulting, forming the externally visible high-peaked roof of the church.

TRACERY AND GLASS. With the growth in the size of the windows and the progressive suppression of the lateral walls of vaulted structures, stained glass came more and more generally into use. Its introduction not only resulted in a notable heightening and enriching of the colors and scheme of the interior decoration, but reacted on the architecture, intensifying the very causes which led to its introduction. It stimulated the increase in the size of windows, and the suppression of the walls, and contributed greatly to the development of *tracery*. This latter feature was an absolute necessity for the support of the glass. Its evolution can be traced (Figs. 113, 114, 115) from the simple coupling of twin windows under a single hood-mould or discharging arch, to the florid net-work of the fifteenth century. In its earlier forms it consisted merely of decorative openings, circles, and quatrefoils, designed as if pierced through slabs of stone (*plate-tracery*), filling the window-heads over coupled windows. Later attention was bestowed upon the form of the stonework, which was made lighter and richly

FIG. 113.—PLATE-TRACERY, CHARLTON-ON-OXMORE.

moulded (*bar-tracery*), rather than upon that of the openings (Fig. 114). Then the circular and geometric patterns employed were abandoned for more flowing and capricious designs (*Flamboyant* tracery, Fig. 115) or (in England) for more rigid and rectangular arrangements (*Perpendicular*, Fig. 138). It is customary to distinguish the periods and styles of Gothic architecture by the character of the tracery.

FIG. 114.—BAR-TRACERY, ST. MICHAEL'S, WARFIELD.

CHURCH PLANS. The original basilica-plan underwent radical modifications during the twelfth and fifteenth centuries. These resulted in part from the changes in construction which have been described, and in part from altered ecclesiastical conditions and requirements. Gothic church architecture was based on cathedral design; and the requirements of the cathedral differed in many respects from those of the monastic churches of the preceding period.

The most important alterations in the plan were in the choir and transepts. The choir was greatly lengthened, the transepts often shortened. The choir was provided with two and often four side-aisles, and one or both of these was commonly carried entirely around the apsidal termination of the choir forming a single or double *ambulatory*. This combination of choir, apse, and ambulatory was called, in French churches, the *chevet*.

Another advance upon Romanesque models was the multipli-

cation of chapels—a natural consequence of the more popular character of the cathedral as compared with the abbey. Frequently lateral chapels were built at each bay of the side-aisles, filling up the space between the deep buttresses, flanking the nave as well as the choir. They were also carried around the *chevet* in most of the French cathedrals (Paris, Bourges, Reims, Amiens, Beauvais, and many others); in many of those in Germany (Magdeburg, Cologne, Frauenkirche at Treves), Spain (Toledo, Leon, Barcelona, Segovia, etc.), and Belgium (Tournay, Antwerp). In England the choir had more commonly a square eastward termination. Secondary transepts occur frequently, and these peculiarities, together with the narrowness and great length of most of the plans, make of the English cathedrals a class by themselves.

FIG. 115.—ROSE WINDOW, CHURCH OF ST. OUEN, ROUEN.

PROPORTIONS AND COMPOSITION. Along with these modifications of the basilican plan should be noticed a great increase in the height and slenderness of all parts of the structure. The lofty clearstory, the arcaded triforium-passage or gallery beneath it, the high pointed pier-arches, the multiplication of slender clustered shafts, and the reduction in the area of the piers, gave to the Gothic churches an interior aspect wholly different from that of the simpler, lower, and more massive Romanesque edifices. The perspective effects of the plans thus modified, especially of the complex choir and *chevet* with their lateral and radial chapels, were remarkably enriched and varied.

The exterior was even more radically transformed by these changes, and by the addition of towers and spires to the fronts, and sometimes to the transepts and to their intersection with the nave. The deep buttresses, terminating in pinnacles, the rich traceries of the great lateral windows, the triple portals profusely sculptured, rose windows of great size under the front and transept gables, combined to produce effects of marvellously varied light and shadow, and of complex and elaborate structural beauty, totally unlike the broad simplicity of the Romanesque exteriors.

4.—FLAMBOYANT DETAIL FROM PULPIT IN STRASBURG CATHEDRAL.

DECORATIVE DETAIL. The mediæval designers aimed to enrich every constructive feature with the most effective play of lights and shades, and to embody in the decorative detail the greatest possible amount of allegory and symbolism, and sometimes of humor besides. The deep doorways and pier-arches were moulded with a rich succession of hollow and convex members; and carvings of saints, apostles, martyrs, and angels, virtues and vices, allegories of reward and punishment, and an extraordinary world of monstrous and grotesque beasts, devils, and goblins filled the capi-

tals and door-arches, peeped over tower-parapets, or leered and grinned from gargoyles and corbels. Another source of decorative detail was the application of tracery like that of the windows to wall-panelling, to balustrades, to openwork gables, to spires, to choir-screens, and other features, especially in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (cathedrals of York, Rouen, Cologne; Henry VII.'s Chapel, Westminster). And finally in the carving of capitals and the ornamentation of mouldings the artists of the thirteenth century and their successors abandoned completely the classic models and traditions which still survived in the early twelfth century. The later monastic builders began to look directly to nature for suggestions of decorative form. The lay builders who sculptured the capitals and crockets and finials of the early Gothic cathedrals adopted and followed to its finality this principle of recourse to nature, especially to plant life. At first the budding shoots of early spring were freely imitated or skilfully conventionalized, as being by their thick and vigorous forms the best adapted for translation into stone (Fig. 117). During the thirteenth century the more advanced stages of plant growth, and leaves more complex and detailed, furnished the models for the carver, who displayed his skill in a closer and more literal imitation of their minute veinings and indentations (Fig. 118). This artistic adaptation of natural forms to architectural decoration degenerated later into a minutely realistic copying of natural foliage, in which cleverness of execution took the place of original invention. The spirit of display is characteristic of all late Gothic work. Slenderness, minuteness



FIG. 117.—EARLY GOTHIC CARVING.

of detail, extreme complexity and intricacy of design, an unrestrained profusion of decoration covering every surface, a lack of largeness and vigor in the conceptions, are conspicuous traits of Gothic design in the fifteenth century, alike in France, England, Germany, Spain, and the Low Countries. Having worked out to their conclusion the structural principles bequeathed to them by the preceding centuries, the authors of these later works seemed to have devoted themselves to the elaboration of mere decorative detail, and in technical finish surpassed all that had gone before (Fig. 116).

FIG. 118.—CARVING, DECORATED PERIOD, FROM SOUTHWELL MINSTER.

CHARACTERISTICS SUMMARIZED. In the light of the preceding explanations Gothic architecture may be defined as that system of structural design and decoration which grew up out of the effort to combine, in one harmonious and organic conception, the basilican plan with a complete and systematic construction of groined vaulting. Its development was controlled throughout by considerations of stability and structural propriety, but in the application of these considerations the artistic spirit was allowed full scope for its exercise. Refinement, good taste, and great fertility of imagination characterize the details and ornaments of Gothic structures. While the Greeks, in harmonizing the requirements of utility and beauty in architecture, approached the problem from the æsthetic side, the Gothic architects did the same from the structural side. Their admirably reasoned structures

express as perfectly the idea of vastness, mystery, and complexity as do the Greek temples that of simplicity and monumental repose.

The excellence of Gothic architecture lay not so much in its individual details as in its perfect adaptation to the purposes for which it was developed—its triumphs were achieved in the building of cathedrals and large churches. In the domain of civil and domestic architecture it produced nothing comparable with its ecclesiastical edifices, because it was the requirements of the cathedral and not of the palace, town-hall, or dwelling, that gave it its form and character.

PERIODS. The history of Gothic architecture is commonly divided into three periods, chiefly distinguished by the character of the window-tracery. It must, however, be admitted that this division, like all efforts to cut the history of architectural development into definite slices called periods, is a purely arbitrary process. The various recognizable phases even of tracery-design were not reached at the same time in different parts even of one country, nor did the movement in this field of design coincide exactly with that in any other. It is, nevertheless, often convenient to group the works of the style into broadly indicated periods in which certain characteristics dominate; and the commonly recognized periods are therefore here given, with a summary of the characteristics of each.

Early Pointed Period. [*Early French; Early English* or *Lancet* Period in England; *Early German*, etc.] Simple ribbed vaults; general simplicity and vigor of design and detail; conventionalized foliage of small plants; plate-tracery, and narrow windows coupled under pointed arch with circular foiled openings in the window-head. (In France, 1160 to 1275.)

Middle Pointed Period. [*Rayonnant* in France; *Decorated* or *Geometric* in England.] Vaults more perfect; in England multiple ribs and liernes; greater slenderness and loftiness of proportions; decoration much richer, less vigorous; more naturalistic

carving of mature foliage; walls nearly suppressed, windows of great size, bar-tracery with slender moulded mullions and geometric combinations (circles and cusps) in window-heads, circular (rose) windows. (In France, 1275 to 1375.)

Florid Gothic Period. [*Flamboyant* in France; *Perpendicular* in England.] Vaults of varied and richly decorated design; fan-vaulting and pendants in England, vault-ribs curved into fanciful patterns in Germany and Spain; profuse and minute decoration and cleverness of technical execution substituted for dignity of design; highly realistic carving and sculpture, flowing or flamboyant tracery in France; perpendicular bars with horizontal transoms and four-centred arches in England: "branch-tracery" in Germany. (In France, 1375 to 1525.)

CHAPTER XVI.

GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE IN FRANCE.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: As before, Adamy, Corroyer, Enlart, Hasak, Moore, Porter, Reber, Viollet-le-Duc.* Also *Archives de la commission des monuments.* Chapuy, *Le moyen age monumental.* Chateau, *Histoire et caractères de l'architecture française.* Davies, *Architectural Studies in France.* Gonse, *L'Art Gothique.* Huss, *Rational Building* (tr. from V.-le-Duc). Johnson, *Early French Architecture.* King, *The Study book of Mediæval Architecture and Art.* Lassus and Viollet-le-Duc, *Notre Dame de Paris.* Nesfield, *Specimens of Mediæval Architecture.* Pettit, *Architectural Studies in France.*

CATHEDRAL-BUILDING IN FRANCE. In the development of the principles outlined in the foregoing chapter the church builders of France led the way. They surpassed all their contemporaries in readiness of invention, in quickness and directness of reasoning, and in artistic refinement. These qualities were especially manifested in the extraordinary architectural activity which marked the second half of the twelfth century and the first half of the thirteenth. This was the great age of cathedral-building in France. The adhesion of the bishops to the royal cause, and their position in popular estimation as the champions of justice and human rights, led to the rapid recovery by the episcopacy of its ancient power and influence. The cathedral, as the throne-church of the bishop, became a truly popular institution. New cathedrals were founded on every side, especially in the Royal

* Consult especially articles ARCHITECTURE, CATHÉDRALE, CHAPELLE, CONSTRUCTION, ÉGLISE, MAISON, VOÛTE.

Domain and the adjoining provinces of Normandy, Burgundy, and Champagne, and their construction was warmly seconded by the people, the communes, and the municipalities. "Nothing to-day," says Viollet-le-Duc,* "unless it be the commercial movement which has covered Europe with railway lines, can give an idea of the zeal with which the urban populations set about building cathedrals; . . . a necessity at the end of the twelfth century because it was an energetic protest against feudalism." The collapse of the unscientific Romanesque vaulting of some of the earlier cathedrals and the destruction by fire of others stimulated this movement by the necessity for their immediate rebuilding. The entire reconstruction of the cathedrals of Bayeux, Bayonne, Cambray, Evreux, Laon, Lisieux, Le Mans, Noyon, Poitiers, Senlis, Soissons, and Troyes was begun between 1130 and 1200.† The cathedrals of Bourges, Chartres, Paris, and Tours, and the royal abbey of St. Denis, all of the first importance, were begun during the same period, and during the next quarter-century those of Amiens, Auxerre, Rouen, Reims, Séez, and many others. After 1250 the movement slackened and finally ceased. Few important cathedrals were erected during the latter half of the thirteenth century, the chief among them being at Beauvais (actually begun 1247), Clermont, Coutances, Limoges, Narbonne, and Rodez. During this period, and through the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, French architecture was concerned rather with the completion and remodelling of existing cathedrals than the founding of new ones. There were, however, many important parish churches and civil or domestic edifices erected within this period.

STRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT: VAULTING. By the middle of the twelfth century the use of barrel-vaulting over the nave had been generally abandoned and groined vaulting with its isolated

* *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française*, vol. ii., pp. 280, 281.

† See Ferree, *Chronology of Cathedral Churches of France.*

points of support and resistance had taken its place. The timid experiments of the Clunisian architects at Vézelay in the use of the pointed arch and vault-ribs also led, in the second half of the twelfth century, to far-reaching results. The builders of the great **Abbey Church** of **St. Denis,** near Paris, begun in 1140 by the Abbot Suger, appear to have been the first to develop these tentative devices into a system. In the original choir of this noble church all the arches, alike of the vault-ribs (except the groin-ribs, which were semicircles) and of the openings, were pointed and the vaults were throughout constructed with cross-ribs, wall-ribs, and groin-ribs. Of this early work only the chapels remain. In other contemporary monuments, as for instance in the cathedral of Sens, the adoption of these devices was only partial and hesitating.



FIG. 119.—PLAN OF NOTRE DAME, PARIS.

NOTRE DAME AT PARIS. The next great step in advance was taken in the cathedral of **Notre Dame*** at Paris (Figs. 119, 120, 128). This was begun under Maurice de Sully in 1163, on the site of the twin cathedrals of Ste. Marie and St. Étienne, and the choir was, as usual, the first portion erected. By 1196 the choir, transepts, and one or two bays of the nave, and by 1235 the entire nave and west front, were finished. The completeness, harmony, and vigor of conception of this remarkable church contrast strikingly with the makeshifts and hesitancy displayed in many contemporary

*This cathedral will be hereafter referred to, for the sake of brevity, by the name of *Notre Dame*. Other cathedrals having the same name will be distinguished by the addition of the name of the city, as "Notre Dame at Châlons-sur-Marne."

monuments in other provinces. The difficult vaulting over the radiating bays of the double ambulatory was here treated with great elegance. By increasing the number of supports successively in the exterior circuit of each aisle (Fig. 119) each trapezoidal bay of the vaulting was divided into three or five easily managed triangular compartments. Circular shafts were used between the central and side aisles. The side aisles were doubled and those next the centre were built in two stories, pro-

FIG. 120.—INTERIOR OF NOTRE DAME, PARIS.

viding ample galleries behind a very open triforium. The nave was unusually lofty and covered with six-part vaults of admirable execution. The vault-ribs were vigorously moulded and made to spring from distinct vaulting-shafts, of which three rested upon the cap of each of the massive piers below (Fig. 120). The **Cathedral of Bourges,** begun 1190, closely resembled that of Paris in plan. Both were designed to accommodate vast throngs in their exceptionally broad central aisles and double side aisles, but Bourges has no side-aisle galleries, though the inner aisles are much loftier than the outer ones. Though later in date the vaulting of

Bourges is inferior to that of Notre Dame, especially in the treatment of the trapezoidal bays of the ambulatory.

The masterly examples set by the vault-builders of St. Denis and Notre Dame were not at once generally followed. Noyon, Senlis, and Soissons, contemporary with these, are far less completely Gothic in style. At **Le Mans** the groined vaulting of the cathedral, erected in 1158, is singularly primitive and heavy, although nearly contemporary with that of Notre Dame (Fig. 121).



FIG. 121.—LE MANS CATHEDRAL. NAVE.

DOMICAL GROINED VAULTING. The builders of the South and West, influenced by Aquitanian models, adhered to the square plan and domical form of vaulting-bay, even after they had begun to employ groin-ribs. The latter, as at first used by them in imitation of Northern examples, had no organic function in the vault, which was still built like a dome. About 1145-1160 the cathedral of **St. Maurice** at **Angers** was vaulted with square, groin-ribbed vaults, domical in form but not in construction. The joints no longer described horizontal circles as in a dome, but oblique lines perpendicular to the groins and meeting in zig-zag lines at the ridge (Fig. 122). This method became common in the West and was afterward generally adopted by the English architects. The **Cathedrals** of **Poitiers** (1162) and **Laval** (La Trinité, 1180–1185) are examples of this system, which at Le Mans met with the Northern system

and produced in the cathedral the awkward compromise described above.

THIRTEENTH-CENTURY VAULTING. Early in the thirteenth century the church-builders of Northern France abandoned the use of square vaulting-bays and six-part vaults. By the adoption of groin-ribs and the pointed arch, the building of vaults in oblong bays was greatly simplified. Each bay of the nave received its own complete vault, thus doing away with all necessity for alternately light and heavy piers. It is not quite certain when and where this system was first adopted for the complete vaulting of a church. It is, however, probable that the **Cathedral** of **Chartres,** begun in 1194* and completed before 1240, deserves this distinction, although it is possible that the vaults of Soissons and Noyon may slightly antedate it. **Troyes** (1214–1267), **Rouen** (1202–1220), **Reims** (1212–1242), **Auxerre** (1215–1234, nave fourteenth century), **Amiens** (1220–1288), and nearly all the great churches and chapels begun after 1200, employ the fully developed oblong vault.



FIG. 122.—GROINED VAULT WITH ZIG-ZAG RIDGE-JOINTS.

a shows a small section of filling with courses parallel to the ridge, for comparison with the other compartments.

BUTTRESSING. Meanwhile the increasing height of the clearstories and the use of double aisles compelled the bestowal of especial attention upon the buttressing. The nave and choir of Chartres, the choirs of Notre Dame, Bourges, Rouen, and

* Except W. front and S. W. tower, retained from earlier building of 1145-1170.

Reims, the chevet and later the choir of St. Denis, afford early examples of the flying-buttress (Fig. 110). These were at first simple and of moderate height. Single half-arches spanned the side aisles; in Notre Dame they crossed the double aisles in a single leap. Later the buttresses were given greater stability by the added weight of lofty pinnacles. An intermediate range of buttresses and pinnacles was built over the intermediate piers where double aisles flanked the nave and choir, thus dividing the single flying arch into two arches. At the same time a careful observation of statical defects in the earlier examples led to the introduction of double arches and of other devices to stiffen and to beautify the whole system. At **Reims** and **Amiens** these features received their highest development, though later examples are frequently much more ornate.

INTERIOR DESIGN. The progressive change outlined in the last chapter, by which the wall was practically suppressed, the windows correspondingly enlarged, and every part of the structure made loftier and more slender, resulted in the evolution of a system of interior design well represented by the nave of Amiens. The second story or gallery over the side aisle disappeared, but the aisle itself was very high. The triforium was no longer a gallery, but a richly arcaded passage in the thickness of the wall, corresponding to the roofing-space over the aisle, and generally treated like a lower stage of the clearstory. Nearly the whole space above it was occupied in each bay by the vast clearstory window filled with simple but effective geometric tracery over slender mullions. The side aisles were lighted by windows which, like those in the clearstory, occupied nearly the whole available wall-space under the vaulting. The piers and shafts were all clustered and remarkably slender. The whole construction of this vast edifice, which covers nearly eighty thousand square feet, is a marvel of lightness, of scientific combinations, and of fine execution. Its great vault rises to a height of one hundred and forty feet. The nave of St. Denis, though less lofty, resembles it

closely in style (Fig. 123). Earlier cathedrals show less of the harmony of proportion, the perfect working out of the relation of all parts of the composition of each bay, so conspicuous in the Amiens type, which was followed in most of the later churches.

FIG. 123.—ONE BAY, ABBEY OF ST. DENIS.

WINDOWS: TRACERY. The clearstory windows of Noyon, Soissons, Sens, and the choir of Vézelay (1200) were simple arched openings arranged singly, in pairs, or in threes. In the cathedral of Chartres (1194–1220) they consist of two arched windows with a circle above them, forming a sort of plate tracery under a single arch. In the chapel windows of the choir at Reims (1215) the tracery of mullions and circles was moulded inside and out, and the intermediate triangular spaces all pierced and glazed. Rose windows were early used in front and transept façades. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries they were made of vast size and great lightness of tracery, as in the transepts of Notre Dame (1257) and the west front of Amiens (1288). From the design of these windows is derived the name *Rayonnant*, often applied to the French Gothic style of the period 1275–1375.

THE SAINTE CHAPELLE. In this beautiful royal chapel at Paris, built 1242–47, Gothic design was admirably exemplified in the noble windows 15 by 50 feet in size, which perhaps furnished the models for those of Amiens and St. Denis. Each was divided by slender mullions into four lancet-like lights gathered under the rich tracery of the window-head. They were filled with stained glass of the most brilliant but harmonious hues. They occupy

the whole available wall-space, so that the ribbed vault internally seems almost to rest on walls of glass, so slender are the visible supports and so effaced by the glow of color in the windows. Certainly lightness of construction and the suppression of the wall-masonry could hardly be carried further than here (Fig. 124). Among other chapels of the same type are those in the palace of St. Germain-en-Laye (1240), and a later example in the château of Vincennes, begun by Charles VI., but not finished till 1525.

PLANS. The most radical change from the primitive basilican type was, as already explained in the last chapter, the continuation of the side-aisles around the apse to form an ambulatory, and with the addition of chapels between the radiating apse buttresses, a *chevet* (Fig. 125). These may have originated in the apsidal chapels of Romanesque churches in Auvergne and the South, as at Issoire, Clermont-Ferrand, Le Puy, and Toulouse. They generally superseded the transept-chapels of earlier churches, and added greatly to the beauty of the interior perspective, especially when the encircling aisles of the chevet were doubled. Notre Dame had at first a double ambulatory, without chapels, these being added later. Bourges has only five very small semicircular chapels. Chartres (choir 1198) and Le

FIG. 124.—THE SAINTE CHAPELLE, PARIS.

Mans, as reconstructed between 1217 and 1254, have double ambulatories and radial chapels. After 1220 the second ambulatory no longer appears. Noyon, Soissons, Reims, Amiens, Troyes, and Beauvais, Tours, Bayeux, and Coutances, Clermont, Limoges, and Narbonne all have the single ambulatory and radiating chevet-chapels. The Lady-chapel in the axis of the church was often made longer and more important than the other chapels, as at Amiens, Le Mans, Rouen, Bayeux, and Coutances. Chapels also flanked the choir in most of the cathedrals named above, and Notre Dame, Alby, Laon, and Tours also have side chapels to the nave. These are of late date; those of Notre Dame, 1300–1320. The only cathedrals with complete double side-aisles alike to nave, choir, and chevet, were Notre Dame and Bourges. It is somewhat singular that the German cathedral of Cologne is the only one in which all these various characteristic French features were united in one design (see Fig. 146).



FIG. 125.—PLAN OF AMIENS CATHEDRAL.

Local considerations had full sway in France, in spite of the tendency toward unity of type. Thus Dol, Laon, and Poitiers have square eastward terminations; Châlons has no ambulatory; Bourges no transept. In Notre Dame the transept was almost suppressed. At Soissons one transept, at Noyon both, had semicircular ends. **Alby,** a late cathedral of brick, founded in 1280, but mostly built during the fourteenth century, has neither side-aisles nor transepts, its wide nave being flanked by chapels separated by internal buttresses (Fig. 126).

SCALE. The French cathedrals were nearly all of imposing dimensions. Noyon, one of the smallest, is 333 feet long; Sens measures 354. Laon, Bourges, Troyes, Notre Dame, Le Mans, Rouen, and Chartres vary from 396 to 437 feet in extreme length; Reims measures 483, and Amiens, the longest of all, 521 feet. Notre Dame is 124 feet wide across the five aisles of the nave; Bourges, somewhat wider. The central aisles of these two cathedrals, and of Laon, Amiens, and Beauvais, have a span of not far from 40 feet from centre to centre of the piers; while the ridge of the vaulting, which in Notre Dame is 108 feet above the pavement, and in Bourges 125, reaches in Amiens a height of 140 feet, and of nearly 160 in Beauvais. This emphasis of the height, from 3 to 3½ times the clear width of the nave or choir, is one of the most striking features of the French cathedrals. It produces an impressive effect, but tends to dwarf the great width of the central aisle.



FIG. 126.—PLAN OF CATHEDRAL OF ALBY.

EXTERIOR DESIGN. Here, as in the interior, every feature had its constructive *raison d'être*, and the total effect was determined by the fundamental structural scheme. This was especially true of the lateral elevations, in which the pinnacled buttresses, the flying arches, and the traceried windows of the side-aisle and clearstory, repeated uniformly at each bay, were the principal elements of the design. The transept façades and main front allowed greater scope for invention and fancy, but even here the interior membering gave the key to the composition. Strong buttresses marked the division of the aisles and resisted the

thrust of the terminal pier arches, and rose windows filled the greater part of the wall space under the end of the lofty vaulting. The whole structure was crowned by a steep-pitched roof of wood, covered with lead, copper, or tiles, to protect the vault from damage by snow and moisture. This roof occasioned the steep gables which crowned the transept façades. The main front was frequently adorned, above the triple portal, with a gallery of niches or tabernacles filled with statues of kings, and the end of the roof above masked by an arcade. Different types of composition are represented by Chartres, Notre Dame, Amiens, Reims, and Rouen, of which Notre Dame (Fig. 127) and Reims are perhaps the finest. Notre Dame is especially remarkable for its stately simplicity and the even balancing of horizontal and vertical elements.

FIG. 127.—WEST FRONT OF NOTRE DAME, PARIS.

PORCHES. In most French church façades the porches were the most striking features, with their deep shadows and sculptured arches. The Romanesque porches were usually limited in depth to the thickness of the front wall. The Gothic builders secured increased depth by projecting the portals out beyond the wall, and crowned them with elaborate gables. The wide central door was

divided in two by a pier adorned with a niche and statue. Over this the tympanum of the arch was carved with scriptural reliefs; the jambs and arches were profusely adorned with figures of saints, apostles, martyrs, and angels, under elaborate canopies. The porches of Laon, Bourges, Amiens, and Reims are especially deep and majestic in effect, the last-named (completed 1380) being



FIG. 128.—WEST FRONT OF ST. MACLOU, ROUEN.

the richest of all. Some of the transept façades also had imposing portals. Those of **Chartres** (1210–1245) rank among the finest works of Gothic decorative architecture. The portals of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries were remarkable for the extraordinary richness of their decorative tracery, as at Abbeville, Alençon, the cathedral and St. Maclou at Rouen (Fig. 128), Tours, Troyes, Vendôme, etc.

TOWERS AND SPIRES. The emphasizing of vertical elements reached its fullest expression in the towers and spires of th

churches. What had been at first merely a lofty belfry roof was rapidly developed into the spire, rising three hundred feet or more into the air. This development had already made progress in the Romanesque period, and the south spire of Chartres is a notable example of twelfth-century steeple design. The transition from the square tower to the octagonal pyramid was skilfully effected by means of corner pinnacles and dormers. After 1200 the development was in the direction of richness and complexity of detail, rather than of radical constructive modification. The northern spire of Chartres (1515) and the spires of Bordeaux, Coutances, Senlis, and the Flamboyant church of St. Maclou at Rouen, illustrate this development. In Normandy central spires were common, rising over the crossing of nave and transepts. In some cases the designers of cathedrals contemplated a group of towers; this is evident at Chartres, Coutances, Laon, and Reims. This intention was, however, never realized; it demanded resources beyond even the enthusiasm of the thirteenth century. Only in rare instances were the spires of any of the towers completed, and the majority of the French towers have square terminations, with low-pitched wooden roofs, generally invisible from below. In general, French towers are marked by their strong buttresses, solid lower stories, huge twin windows in each side of the belfry proper, and a skilful management of the transition to an octagonal plan for the belfry or the spire.

CARVING AND SCULPTURE. The general superiority of French Gothic work was fully maintained in its decorative details. Especially fine is the figure sculpture, which in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries attained true nobility of expression, combined with great truthfulness and delicacy of execution. Some of its finest productions are found in the great doorway jambs of the west portals of the cathedrals, and in the ranks of throned and adoring angels which adorned their deep arches. These reach their highest beauty in the portals of Reims (1380). The *tabernacles* or carved niches in which such statues were set

were important elements in the decoration of the exteriors of churches.

Foliage forms were used for nearly all the minor carved ornaments, though grotesque and human figures sometimes took their place. The gargoyles through which the roofwater was discharged clear of the building were almost always composed in the forms of hideous monsters; and symbolic beasts, like the oxen in the towers of Laon, or monsters like those which peer from the



FIG. 129.—FRENCH GOTHIC CAPITALS.

a, From Sainte Chapelle, Paris, 13th century. *b*, 14th-century capital from transept of Notre Dame, Paris. *c*, 15th-century capital from north spire of Chartres.

tower balustrades of Notre Dame, were employed with some mystical significance in various parts of the building. But the capitals, corbels, crockets, and finials were mostly composed of floral or foliage forms. Those of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries were for the most part simple in mass, and crisp and vigorous in design, imitating the strong shoots of early spring. The **capitals** were tall and slender, concave in profile, with heavy square or octagonal abaci. After the middle of the thirteenth century the carving became more realistic; the leaves, larger and more mature, were treated as if applied to the capital or moulding, not as if they grew out of it. The execution and detail were finer and more delicate, in harmony with the increasing slenderness and

lightness of the architecture (Fig. 129 *a*, *b*). **Tracery forms** now began to be profusely applied to all manner of surfaces, and open-work gables, wholly unnecessary from the structural point of view, but highly effective as decorations, adorned the portals and crowned the windows.

LATE GOTHIC MONUMENTS. So far our attention has been mainly occupied with the masterpieces erected previous to 1250. Among the cathedrals, relatively few in number, whose construction is referable to the second half of the century, that of **Beauvais** stands first in importance. Begun on a colossal scale in 1225, the choir and chapels were not completed until 1270. But the collapse in 1284 of the central tower and excessively lofty vaulting of this cathedral, which still lacked the nave, compelled its entire reconstruction, the number of the piers being doubled and the span of the pier arches correspondingly reduced. As thus rebuilt, the central aisle was 51 feet wide from centre to centre of opposite piers, and 163 feet high to the top of the vault. Transepts were added after 1500. **Limoges** and **Narbonne,** begun in 1272 on a large scale (though not equal in size to Beauvais), were likewise never completed. Both had choirs of admirable plan, with well-designed chevet-chapels. Many other cathedrals begun during this period were completed only after long delays, as, for instance, Meaux, Rodez (1277), Toulouse (1272), and Alby (1282),



FIG. 130.—OPENWORK GABLE, FROM FRONT OF ROUEN CATHEDRAL.

finished in the sixteenth century, and Clermont (1248), completed under Napoleon III. But between 1260 or 1275 and 1350 work was actively prosecuted on many still incomplete cathedrals. The choirs of Beauvais (rebuilding), Limoges, and Narbonne were finished after 1330; and towers, transept-

FIG. 131.—NORTH PORCH OF CHARTRES CATHEDRAL.

façades, portals, and chapels added to many others of earlier date.

The style of this period is sometimes designated as **Rayonnant,** from the characteristic wheel tracery of the rose windows, and the prevalence of circular forms in the lateral arched windows of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. The great rose windows in the transepts of Notre Dame, dating from 1257, are typical examples of the style. Those of Rouen cathedral belong to the same category, though of later date. The façade of Amiens, completed by 1288, is one of the finest works of this

style, of which an early example is the elaborate parish church of **St. Urbain** at Troyes.

THE FLAMBOYANT STYLE. The geometric treatment of the tracery and the minute and profuse decoration of this period gradually merged into the fantastic and unrestrained extravagances of the **Flamboyant** style, which prevailed until the advent of the Renaissance—say 1525. The continuous logical development of forms ceased, and in its place caprice and display controlled the arts of design. The finest monument of this long period is the fifteenth-century nave and central tower of the church of **St. Ouen** at Rouen, a parish church of the first rank, begun in 1318, but not finished until 1515. The tracery of the lateral windows is still chiefly geometric, but the western rose window (Fig. 115) and the magnificent central tower or lantern exhibit in their tracery the florid decoration and wavy, flame-like lines of this style. Slenderness of supports and the suppression of horizontal lines are here carried to an extreme; and the church, in spite of its great elegance of detail, lacks the vital interest and charm of the earlier Gothic churches. The cathedral of Alençon and the church of **St. Maclou** at Rouen have portals with unusually elaborate detail of tracery and carving; while the unfinished façade of Rouen cathedral (1509) surpasses all other examples in the lace-like minuteness of its open-work and its profusion of ornament. The churches of **St. Jacques** at Dieppe, and of **St. Wulfrand** at Abbeville, the façades of Tours and Troyes, are among the masterpieces of the style. The upper part of the façade of Reims (1380–1428) belongs to the translation from the Rayonnant to the Flamboyant. While some works of this period are conspicuous for the richness of their ornamentation, others are noticeably bare and poor in design, like St. Merri and St. Séverin in Paris. The most successful examples of this period are rather its minor than its major undertakings: altars, tombs, choir-screens, portals and spires, choir-stalls and pulpits, often executed in parish churches or chapels; *e.g.* the church of Brou at

Bourg-en-Bresse, the chapel of St. Esprit at Rue, Ste. Madeleine at Troyes, etc.

SECULAR AND MONASTIC ARCHITECTURE. The building of cathedrals did not absorb all the architectural activity of the French during the Gothic period, nor did it by any means put an end to monastic building. While there are few Gothic cloisters to equal the Romanesque cloisters of Puy-en-Vélay, Montmajour, Elne, and Moissac, many of the abbeys either rebuilt their churches in the Gothic style after 1150, or extended and remodelled their conventual buildings. The cloisters of Fontfroide, Chaise-Dieu, and the Mont St. Michel rival those of Romanesque times, while many new refectories and chapels were built in the same style with the cathedrals. The most complete of these Gothic monastic establishments, that of the **Mont St. Michel** in Normandy, presents a remarkable aggregation of buildings clustering around the steep isolated rock on which stands the abbey church, built in the eleventh century (choir and chapels remodelled in the sixteenth). The great refectory and dormitory, the "Hall of the Knights," cloisters and chapels, built in several vaulted stories against the cliffs, are admirable examples of the vigorous pointed-arch design of the early thirteenth century.

Hospitals like that of St. Jean at Angers (late twelfth century), or those of Chartres, Ourscamps, Tonnerre, and Beaune, illustrate how skilfully the French could modify and adapt the details of their architecture to the special requirements of civil architecture. Great numbers of charitable institutions were built in the middle ages, but few of those in France are now extant. Town halls were built in the fifteenth century in some places where a certain amount of popular independence had been secured (*e.g.* Compiègne). The florid sixteenth-century **Palais de Justice** at **Rouen** (1499–1508) is an example of another branch of secular Gothic architecture. In all these monuments the adaptation of means to ends is admirable. Wooden ceilings and roofs replaced

stone, wherever required by great width of span or economy of construction. There was little sculpture; the wall-spaces were not suppressed in favor of stained glass and tracery; while the roofs were usually emphasized and adorned with elaborate crestings and finials in lead or terra-cotta.

DOMESTIC ARCHITECTURE. These same principles controlled the designing of houses, farm buildings, barns, granaries, and the like. The common closely-built French city house of the twelfth and thirteenth century is illustrated by many extant examples at Cluny, Provins, and other towns. A shop opening on the street by a large arch, a narrow stairway, and two or three stories of rooms lighted by clustered, pointed-arched windows, constituted the common type. The street front was usually gabled and the roof steep. In the fourteenth or fifteenth century half-timbered construction began to supersede stone for town houses, as it permitted of encroaching upon the street by projecting the upper stories. Many of the half-timbered houses of the fifteenth century were of elaborate design. The heavy oaken uprights were carved with slender colonnettes; the horizontal sills, bracketed out over the street, were richly moulded; picturesque dormers broke the sky-line, and the masonry filling between the beams was frequently faced with enamelled tiles.

The more considerable houses or palaces of royalty, nobles, and wealthy citizens rivalled, and in time surpassed, the monastic buildings in richness and splendor. Their architecture is a development from that of the earlier feudal castles, whose enormously massive walls, round towers, corbelled and machicolated roof-galleries, drawbridges, barbicans and central donjon or keep, were designed wholly from the military point of view.* By 1250, the increasing ascendancy of the royal power and more settled conditions permitted the erection of less frowning and more comfortable residences for the nobility, especially in

* See articles ARCHITECTURE MILITAIRE and CHÂTEAU, in *Dictionnaire raisonné* of Viollet-le-Duc.

the cities. The earlier examples, however, still retain the military aspect, with moat and donjon, as in the Louvre of Charles V., demolished in the sixteenth century. The château de **Pierrefonds,** remodelled by V. le-Duc upon the ruins of a late fourteenth century castle, is a modernized example of these semi-military palaces. The finest palaces are of late date, and



FIG. 132.—HOUSE OF JACQUES CŒUR, BOURGES
(After Viollet-le-Duc.)

the type is well represented by the Ducal Palace at Nancy (1476), the **Hotel de Cluny** (1485), at Paris, the **Hotel Jacques Cœur** at Bourges (Fig. 132), and the east wing of Blois (1498-1515). These palaces are elaborately planned, with large halls, many staircases, and handsome courts; they are also extremely picturesque with their square and circular towers, slender turrets, elaborate dormers, and rich carved detail.

MONUMENTS: (C. = cathedral; A. = abbey; trans. = transept; each edifice is given under the date of its commencement; subse-

quent alterations in parentheses.) Between 1130 and 1200: Vézelay A., ante-chapel, 1130; St. Germer-de-Fly C., 1130-1150 (chapel later); St. Denis A., choir, 1140 (choir rebuilt, nave and trans., 1240); Sens C., 1140-68 (W. front, 13th century; chapels, spire, 14th); Senlis C., 1145-83 (trans., spire, 13th century); Noyon C., 1149-1200 (W. front, vaults, 13th century); St. Germain-des-Prés A., Paris, choir, 1150 (Romanesque nave); Angers C., 1150 (choir, trans., 1274); Langres, 1150-1200; Laon C., 1150-1200; Le Mans C., nave, 1150-58 (choir, 1217-54); Soissons C., 1160-70 (choir, 1212; nave chapels, 14th century); Poitiers C., 1162-1204; Notre Dame, Paris, choir, 1163-96 (nave, W. front finished, 1235; trans. fronts and chapels, 1257-75); Chartres C., W. end, 1145-1170; rest, mainly 1194-98 (trans. porches, W. rose, 1210-1260; N. spire, 1506); Tours C., 1170 (rebuilt, 1267; trans. portals, 1375; W. portals, chapels, 15th century; towers finished, 1507-47); Laval C., 1180-85 (choir, 16th century); Mantes, church Notre Dame, 1180-1200; Bourges C., 1190-95 (E. end, 1210; W. end, 1275); St. Nicholas at Caen, 1190 (vaults, 15th century); Reims, church St. Rémy, choir, end of 12th century (Romanesque nave); church St. Leu d'Esserent, choir late 12th century (nave, 13th century); Lyons C., choir, end of 12th century (nave, 13th and 14th centuries); Étampes, church Notre Dame, 12th and 13th centuries.—13th century: Evreux C., 1202-75 (trans., central tower, 1417; W. front rebuilt, 16th century); Rouen C., 1202-20 (trans. portals, 1280; W. front, 1507); Nevers, 1211, N. portal, 1280 (chapels, S. portal, 15th century); Reims C., 1212-42 (W. front, 1380; W. towers, 1420); Bayonne C., 1213 (nave, vaults, W. portal, 14th century); Troyes C., choir, 1214 (central tower, nave, W. portal, and towers, 15th century); Auxerre C., 1215-34 (nave, W. end, trans., 14th century); Amiens C., 1220-88; St. Etienne at Chalons-sur-Marne, 1230 (spire, 1520); Séez C., 1230, rebuilt 1260 (remodelled 14th century); Notre Dame de Dijon, 1230; Reims, Lady chapel of Archbishop's palace, 1230; Chapel Royal at St. Germain-en-Laye, 1240; Ste. Chapelle at Paris, 1242-47 (W. rose, 15th century); Coutances C., 1254-74; Beauvais C., 1247-72 (rebuilt 1337-47; trans. portals, 1500-48); Notre Dame de Grace at Clermont, 1248 (finished 1350); Dôl C., 13th century; St. Martin-des-Champs at Paris, nave 13th century (choir Romanesque); Bordeaux C., 1260; Narbonne C., 1272-1320; Limoges, 1273 (finished 16th century); St. Urbain, Troyes, 1264; Rodez C., 1277-1385 (altered, completed 16th century); church St. Quentin,

1280-1300; St. Bénigne at Dijon, rebuilt 1280-91; Alby C., 1282 (nave, 14th, choir, 15th century; S. portal, 1473-1500); Meaux C., mainly rebuilt 1284 (W. end much altered 15th, finished 16th century); Cahors C., rebuilt 1285-93 (W. front 15th century); Orléans, 1287-1328 (burned, rebuilt 1601-1829).—14th century: St. Bertrand de Comminges, 1304-50; St. Nazaire at Carcassonne, choir and trans. on Romanesque nave; Montpellier C., 1364; St. Ouen at Rouen, choir, 1318-39 (trans., 1400-39; nave, 1464-91; W. front, 1515); Royal Chapel at Vincennes, 1385-1525.—15th and 16th century: St. Nizier at Lyons rebuilt; St. Séverin, St. Merri, St. Germain l'Auxerrois, all at Paris; Notre Dame de l'Épine at Chalons-sur-Marne; choir of St. Étienne at Beauvais; Saintes C., rebuilt, 1450; St. Maclou at Rouen (finished 16th century); church at Bourg-en-Bresse; St. Wulfrand at Abbeville; abbey of St. Riquier —these three all early 16th century.

Houses, Castles, and Palaces: Bishop's palace at Paris, 1160 (demolished); castle of Coucy, 1220-30; Louvre at Paris (the original château), 1225-1350; Palais de Justice at Paris, originally the royal residence, 1225-1400; Bishop's palace at Laon, 1245 (addition to Romanesque hall); castle Montargis, 13th century; castle Pierrefonds, late 15th century, remodelled 1870; Bishop's palace at Narbonne, palace of Popes at Avignon—all 14th century; donjon of palace at Poitiers, 1395; Pal. de Justice (Salle de la Prévôté, Salle des Comtes), Poitiers, 12th-15th century; Hôtel des Ambassadeurs at Dijon, 1420; house of Jacques Cœur at Bourges, 1443; Palace, Dijon, 1467; Ducal palace at Nancy, 1476; Hôtel Cluny at Paris, 1490; castle of Creil, late 15th century, finished in 16th; E. wing palace of Blois, 1498-1515, for Louis XII.; Palais de Justice at Rouen, 1499-1508.

CHAPTER XVII.

GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE IN GREAT BRITAIN.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: As before, Corroyer, Parker, Reber. Also, Bell's Series of *Handbooks of English Cathedrals.* Billings, *The Baronial and Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Scotland.* Bond, *Gothic Architecture in England.* Brandon, *Analysis of Gothic Architecture.* Britton, *Cathedral Antiquities of Great Britain.* Ditchfield, *The Cathedrals of England.* Murray, *Handbooks of the English Cathedrals.* Rickman, *An Attempt to Discriminate the Styles of English Architecture.* Sharpe, *Architectural Parallels; The Seven Periods of English Architecture.* Van Rensselaer, *English Cathedrals.* Winkles and Moule, *Cathedral Churches of England and Wales.* Willis, *Architectural History of Canterbury Cathedral;* ditto, *of Winchester Cathedral; Treatise on Vaults.*

GENERAL CHARACTER. Gothic architecture was developed in England under a strongly established royal power, with an episcopate in no sense hostile to the abbots or in arms against the barons. Many of the cathedrals had monastic chapters, and not infrequently abbots were invested with the episcopal rank. Under Henry VIII. the monasteries were suppressed, and the monastic cathedrals reconstituted under "secular" clergy, though the ex-abbot was sometimes retained as bishop. The other cathedrals, governed originally by "secular" or non-monastic clergy, were left undisturbed, and are known as of the "old foundation".*

* The monastic cathedrals "secularized" by Henry VIII. are often called the "new foundation." Some writers, however, prefer to call them monastic and to use the term "new foundation" only for cathedrals established since Henry VIII.'s time.

English Gothic architecture was thus by no means predominantly an architecture of cathedrals. If architectural activity in England was on this account less intense and widespread in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries than in France, it was not, on the other hand, so soon exhausted. Fewer new cathedrals were built, but the progressive rebuilding of those already existing seems not to have ceased until the middle or end of the fifteenth century. Architecture in England developed more slowly, but more uniformly, than in France. It contented itself with simpler problems; and if it failed to rival Amiens in boldness of construction and in lofty majesty, it at least never perpetrated a folly like Beauvais. In richness of internal decoration, especially in the mouldings and ribbed vaulting, and in the picturesque grouping of simple masses externally, the British builders went far toward atoning for their structural timidity.



FIG. 133.—PLAN OF SALISBURY CATHEDRAL.

EARLY GOTHIC BUILDINGS. The pointed arch and ribbed vault were importations from France. Early examples appear in the Cistercian abbeys of Furness and Kirkstall, and in the Temple Church at London (1185). But it was in the **Choir of Canterbury,** as rebuilt by William of Sens, after the destruction by fire in 1170 of Ernulph's and Conrad's Norman choir, that these French Gothic features were first applied in a thoroughgoing manner. In plan this choir resembled that of the cathedral of Sens; and its coupled round piers, foliated capitals, pointed arches, six-part vaulting, and *chevet*, were distinctly French. The Gothic details thus introduced slowly supplanted the round arch and other Norman features. For fifty years the styles were

more or less mingled in many buildings, though **Lincoln Cathedral,** as rebuilt in 1192–1200, retained nothing of the earlier round-arched style. But the first church to be designed and built from the foundations in the new style was the cathedral of **Salisbury** (1220–1258; Fig. 133). Contemporary with Amiens, it is a homogeneous and typical example of the Early English style. The predilection for great length observable in the Anglo-Norman churches (as at Norwich and Durham) still prevailed, as it continued to do throughout the Gothic period; Salisbury is 480 feet long. The double transepts, the long choir, the square east end, the relatively low vault (84 feet to the ridge), the narrow grouped windows, all are thoroughly English. Only the simple four-part vaulting recalls French models. **Westminster Abbey** (1245–1269),* on the other hand, betrays in a marked manner the French influence in its internal loftiness (100 feet), its polygonal *chevet* and chapels, and its strongly accented exterior flying-buttresses (Fig. 142).

MIXTURE OF STYLES. Very few English cathedrals are as homogeneous as the two just mentioned, nearly all having undergone repeated remodellings in successive periods. Durham, Norwich, and Oxford are wholly Norman but for their Gothic vaults. Ely, Rochester, Gloucester, and Hereford have Norman naves and Gothic choirs.† Peterborough has an early Gothic façade and late Gothic retro-choir added to an otherwise completely Norman structure. Winchester is a Norman church remodelled with early Perpendicular details. The purely Gothic churches and cathedrals—except parish churches, in which England is very rich—are not nearly as numerous in England as in France.

PERIODS. The development of English Gothic architecture

* The western part of the nave and the west front were not completed until 1500.

† But that of Gloucester is merely a reclothing of the Norman choir with late Gothic details and vaulting.

followed the same general sequence as the French, and like it the successive stages are commonly characterized by the forms of the tracery.

The EARLY ENGLISH or LANCET period extended roundly from 1175 to 1260, and was marked by simplicity, dignity, and purity of design.

The DECORATED or GEOMETRIC period covered another century, 1260 to 1360, and was characterized by its decorative richness and greater lightness of construction.



FIG. 134.—RIBBED VAULTING, CHOIR OF EXETER CATHEDRAL.

The PERPENDICULAR period extended from 1360, or thereabout, well into the sixteenth century. Its salient features were the use of fan-vaulting, four-centred arches, and tracery of predominantly vertical and horizontal lines. The tardy introduction of Renaissance forms finally put an end to the Gothic style in England, after a long period of mixed and transitional architecture.

VAULTING. The richness and variety of English vaulting contrast strikingly with the persistent uniformity of the French. A few of the early Gothic vaults, as in the aisles of Peterborough, and later the naves of Chichester, Salisbury, and Gloucester, were simple four-part, ribbed vaults substantially like the French. But the English disliked and avoided the twisted and dome-like surfaces of the French vaults, preferring horizontal ridges, and, in the filling-masonry, straight courses meeting at the ridge in zigzag lines, as in southwest France (see p. 204). This may be seen in

Westminster Abbey. The idea of ribbed construction was then seized upon and given a new application. By springing a large number of ribs from each point of support, the vaulting-surfaces were divided into long, narrow triangles, the filling of which was comparatively easy (Fig. 134). The ridge was itself furnished with a straight rib, decorated with carved rosettes or *bosses* at each intersection with a vaulting-rib. The naves and choirs of Lincoln, Lichfield, Exeter, and the nave of Westminster illustrate

FIG. 135.—NET OR LIERNE VAULTING, TEWKESBURY ABBEY.

this method. The logical corollary of this practice was the introduction of minor ribs called *liernes*, connecting the main ribs and forming complex reticulated and star-shaped patterns. Vaults of this description are among the most beautiful in England. One of the richest is in the choir of Gloucester (1337–1377). Less correct constructively is that over the choir of Wells, while the choir of Ely, the naves of Tewkesbury Abbey (Fig. 135), and of Canterbury and Winchester cathedrals, all built between 1360 and 1400, illustrate the same system. Such vaults are called *lierne* or *star* vaults. The furthest possible development of this

type is seen in the vaults of Norwich Cathedral (1463), of the nave of King's College Chapel, Cambridge, and St. George's Chapel, Windsor.

FAN-VAULTING. The later steps in the process may be observed in the vaults of the nave of Sherborne church, the choir of Oxford Cathedral, the Divinity School at Oxford, the retro-choir of Peterborough, the cloisters of Gloucester, and many other examples. The diverging ribs being made of uniform curvature, the *severeys* (the inverted pyramidal vaulting-masses springing from each support) became a species of concave conoids, meeting at the ridge in such a way as to leave a series of flat lozenge-shaped spaces at the summit of the vault (Fig. 141). The ribs were multiplied indefinitely, and losing thus in individual and structural importance became a mere decorative pattern of tracery on the severeys. To conceal the awkward flat lozenges at the ridge, elaborate panelling was resorted to; or, in some cases, long stone pendants were inserted at those points—a device highly decorative but wholly unconstructive. At Cambridge, in the choir of **King's College Chapel,** and in the **Chapel of Henry VII.** (Fig. 141), at Westminster, this sort of vaulting received its most elaborate development. The *fan-vault*, as it is called, illustrates the logical evolution of a decorative element from a structural starting-point, leading to results far removed from the original conception. Rich and



FIG. 136.—VAULT OF CHAPTER-HOUSE, WELLS.

sumptuous as are these ceilings, they are with all their ornament less satisfactory than the ribbed vaults of the preceding period.

CHAPTER-HOUSES. One of the most beautiful forms of ribbed vaulting was developed in the polygonal halls erected for the deliberations of the cathedral chapters of Lincoln (1225), Westminster (1250), Salisbury (1250), and Wells (1292), in which the vault-ribs radiated from a central column to the sides and angles of the polygon (Fig. 136). If these vaults were less majestic than domes of the same diameter, they were far more decorative and picturesque, while the chapter-houses themselves were the most original and striking products of English Gothic art. Every feature was designed with strict regard for the structural system determined by the admirable vaulting, and the Sainte Chapelle was not more logical in its exemplification of Gothic principles. To the four above-mentioned examples should be added that of York (1280–1330), which differs from them in having no central column: by some critics it is esteemed the finest of them all. Its ceiling is a Gothic dome, 57 feet in diameter, but unfortunately executed in wood. Its geometrical window-tracery and richly canopied stalls are admirable.

OCTAGON AT ELY. The magnificent **Octagon** of Ely Cathedral, at the intersection of the nave and transepts, belongs in the same category with these polygonal chapter-house vaults. It was built by Alan of Walsingham in 1337, after the fall of the central tower and the destruction of the adjacent bays of the choir. It occupies the full width of the three aisles, and covers the ample space thus enclosed with a simple but beautiful groined and ribbed vault of wood reaching to a central octagonal lantern, which rises much higher and shows externally as well as internally. Unfortunately, this vault is of wood, and would require important modifications of detail if carried out in stone. But it is so noble in general design and total effect, that one wonders the type was not universally adopted for the crossing in all cathedrals, until one observes that no cathedral of importance was built after

Walsingham's time, nor did any other central towers opportunely fall to the ground.

WINDOWS AND TRACERY. In the Early English Period (1200–1280 or 1300) the windows were at first tall and narrow (*lancet* windows), and generally grouped by twos and threes, though sometimes four and even five are seen together (as the "Five Sisters" in the N. transept of York). In the nave of Salisbury and the retro-choir of Ely the side aisles are lighted by coupled windows and the clearstory by triple windows, the central one higher than the others—a surviving Norman practice. Plate-tracery was, as in France, an intermediate step leading to the development of bar-tracery (see Fig. 113). The English followed here the same reasoning as the French. At first the openings constituted the design, the intervening stonework being of secondary importance. Later the forms of the openings were subordinated to the pattern of the stone framework of bars, arches, circles, and cusps. Bar-tracery of this description prevailed in England through the greater part of the Decorated Period (1280–1380), and somewhat resembled the contemporary French geometric tracery, though more varied and less rigidly constructive in design. An early example of this tracery occurs in the cloisters of Salisbury (1280; Fig. 137); others in the clearstories of the choirs of Lichfield, Lincoln, and Ely, the nave of York, and the chapter-houses mentioned above, where, indeed, it seems to have received its earliest development. After the middle of the fourteenth century lines of double curvature were introduced, producing what is called *flowing* tracery, somewhat resembling the French flamboyant, though simpler (Fig. 114). Examples of this style

FIG. 137.—CLOISTERS, SALISBURY CATHEDRAL (SHOWING UPPER PART OF CHAPTER-HOUSE).

are found in Wells, in the side aisles and triforium of the choir of Ely, and in the S. transept rose-window of Lincoln.

THE PERPENDICULAR STYLE. Flowing tracery was, however, a transitional phase of design, and was soon superseded by *Perpendicular* tracery, in which the mullions were carried through to the top of the arch and intersected by horizontal transoms. This formed a very rigid and mechanically correct system of stone framing, but lacked the grace and charm of the two preceding periods. The earliest examples are seen in the work of Edington and of Wykeham in the reconstructed cathedral of Winchester (1360–1394), where the tracery was thus made to harmonize with the accentuated and multiplied vertical lines of the interior design. It was at this late date that the English seem first to have fully appropriated the Gothic ideas of emphasized vertical elements and wall surfaces reduced to a minimum. The development of fan-vaulting had led to the adoption of a new form of arch, the four-centred or *Tudor arch* (Fig. 138), to fit under the depressed apex of the vault. The whole design internally and externally was thenceforward controlled by the form of the vaulting and of the openings. The windows were made of enormous size, especially at the east end of the choir, which was square in



FIG. 138.—PERPENDICULAR TRACERY, WEST WINDOW OF ST. GEORGE'S, WINDSOR.

nearly all English churches, and in the west windows over the entrance. These windows had already reached, in the Decorated Period, an enormous size, as at York; in the Perpendicular Period the two ends of the church were as nearly as possible converted into walls of glass. The East Window of Gloucester reaches the prodigious dimensions of 38 by 72 feet. The most complete examples of the Perpendicular tracery and of the style in general are the three chapels already mentioned (p. 227); those, namely, of **King's College** at Cambridge, of **St. George** at Windsor, and of **Henry VII.** in Westminster Abbey.

CONSTRUCTIVE DESIGN. The most striking peculiarity of English Gothic design was its studious avoidance of temerity or venturesomeness in construction. Both the height and width of the nave were kept within very moderate bounds, and the supports were never reduced to extreme slenderness. While much impressiveness of effect was undoubtedly lost thereby, there was some gain in freedom of design, and there was less obtrusion of constructive elements in the exterior composition. The flying-buttress became a feature of minor importance where the clear-story was kept low, as in most English churches. In many cases the flying arches were hidden under the aisle roofs. The English cathedrals and larger churches are long and low, depending for effect mainly upon the projecting masses of their transepts, the imposing square central towers which commonly crown the crossing, and the grouping of the main structure with chapter-houses, cloisters, and Lady-chapels.

FRONTS. The sides and east ends were, in most cases, more successful than the west fronts. In these the English displayed a singular indifference or lack of creative power. They produced nothing to rival the majestic façades of Notre Dame, Amiens, or Reims, and their portals are almost ridiculously small. The front of **York** Cathedral is the most notable in the list for its size and elaborate decoration. Those of **Lincoln** and **Peterborough** are, however, more interesting in the picturesqueness and

singularity of their composition. The first-named forms a vast arcaded screen, masking the bases of the two western towers, and pierced by three huge Norman arches, retained from the original façade. The west front of Peterborough is likewise a mask or screen, mainly composed of three colossal recessed arches, whose vast scale completely dwarfs the little porches which give admittance to the church. Salisbury has a curiously illogical and ineffective façade. Those of **Lichfield** and **Wells** are, on the other hand, imposing and beautiful designs, the first with its twin spires and rich arcading (Fig. 139), the second with its unusual wealth of figure-sculpture, and massive square towers.

FIG. 139.—WEST FRONT, LICHFIELD CATHEDRAL.

CENTRAL TOWERS. These are the most successful features of English exterior design. Most of them form lanterns internally over the crossing, giving to that point a considerable increase of dignity. Externally they are usually massive and lofty square towers, and having been for the most part completed during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries they are marked by great richness and elegance of detail. Durham, York, Ely, Canterbury, Lincoln, and Gloucester may be mentioned as notable examples of such square towers; that of Canterbury is the finest. Two or three have lofty spires over the lantern. Among these, that of Salisbury is chief, rising 424 feet from the ground, admirably

designed in every detail. It was not completed till the middle of the fourteenth century, but most fortunately carries out with great felicity the spirit of the earlier style in which it was begun. Lichfield and Chichester have somewhat similar central spires, but less happy in proportion and detail than the beautiful Salisbury example.

FIG. 140.—ONE BAY OF CHOIR, LICHFIELD CATHEDRAL.

INTERIOR DESIGN. In the Norman churches the pier-arches, triforium, and clearstory were practically equal. In the Gothic churches the pier-arches generally occupy the lower half of the height, the upper half being divided nearly equally between the triforium and clearstory, as in Lincoln, Lichfield (nave), Ely (choir). In some cases, however (as at Salisbury, Westminster, Winchester, choir of Lichfield), the clearstory is magnified at the expense of the triforium (Fig. 140). Three peculiarities of design sharply distinguish the English treatment of these features from the French. The first is the multiplicity of fine mouldings in the pier-arches; the second is the decorative elaboration of design in the triforium; the third, the variety in the treatment of the clearstory. In general the English interiors are much more ornate than the French. Black Purbeck marble is frequently used for the shafts clustered around the central core of the pier, giving a striking and somewhat singular effect of contrasted color. The rich vaulting, the highly decorated triforium, the moulded pier-arches, and at the end of the vista the great east window,

produce an impression very different from the more simple and lofty stateliness of the French cathedrals. The great length and lowness of the English interiors combine with this decorative richness to give the impression of repose and grace, rather than of majesty and power. This tendency reached its highest expression in the Perpendicular churches and chapels, in which every surface was covered with minute panelling.

CARVING. In the Early English Period the details were carved with remarkable vigor. In the capitals and corbels, crockets and finials, the foliage was crisp and fine, curling into convex masses and seeming to spring from the surface which it decorated. Mouldings were frequently ornamented in the hollows with foliage of this character, or with the *dog-tooth* ornament or the *ball-flower*, introducing repeated points of light into the shadows of the mouldings. These were fine and complex, deep hollows alternating with round mouldings (*bowtels*) sometimes made pear-shaped in section by a fillet on one side. *Cusping*—the decoration of an arch or circle by triangular projections on its inner edge—was introduced during this period, and became an important decorative resource, especially in tracery design. In the Decorated Period the foliage was less crisp though sometimes treated with extraordinary realism; sea-weed and oak-leaves, closely and confusedly bunched, were often used in the capitals, while crockets were larger, double-curved, with leaves swelling into convexities like oak-galls. Geometrical and flowing tracery were developed, double curves began to be used in the profiles of mouldings, and the hollows were less frequently adorned with foliage.

In the Perpendicular Period nearly all flat surfaces were panelled in designs resembling the tracery of the windows. The capitals were less important than those of the preceding periods, and the mouldings weaker and less effective. The Tudor rose appears as an ornament in square panels and on flat surfaces; and moulded battlements, which first appeared in Decorated work,

now become a frequent crowning motive in place of a cornice. There is less originality and variety in the ornament, but a great increase in its amount (Fig. 141).

PLANS. English church plans underwent, during the Gothic Period, but little change from the general types established previous to the thirteenth century. The Gothic cathedrals and abbeys, like the Norman, were very long and narrow, with choirs often nearly as long as the nave, and almost invariably with square

FIG. 141.—FAN VAULTING, HENRY VII.'S CHAPEL, WESTMINSTER ABBEY.

eastward terminations. There is no example of double side aisles and side chapels, and apsidal chapels are very rare. Canterbury and Westminster (Fig. 142) are the chief exceptions to this, and both show clearly the French influence. Another striking peculiarity of the English plans is the frequent occurrence of secondary transepts, adding greatly to the external picturesqueness. These occur in rudimentary form in Canterbury, and at Durham the Chapel of the Nine Altars, added 1242–1290 to the eastern end, forms in reality a secondary transept. This feature is most perfectly developed in the cathedral of Salisbury (Fig.

132), and appears also at Lincoln, Worcester, Wells, and Hereford. The English cathedral plans are also distinguished by the retention or incorporation of many conventual features, such as cloisters, libraries, and halls, and by the grouping of chapter-houses and Lady-chapels with the main edifice. Thus the English cathedral plans and those of the great abbey churches present a marked contrast with those of France and the Continent generally. While Amiens, the greatest of French cathedrals, is 521 feet long, and internally 140 feet high, Ely measures 565 feet in length, and less than 75 feet in height. Notre Dame is 148 feet wide; the English naves are usually under 80 feet in total width of the three aisles. No cathedrals were originally built with five aisles. There are, however, a number of parish churches with five aisles, and one of these, at Manchester, has in modern times been converted into the cathedral of a newly-partitioned diocese. The present exterior side aisles of Chichester were formed from the original side-chapels of the nave.



FIG. 142.—EASTERN HALF OF WESTMINSTER ABBEY. PLAN.
a, Henry VII.'s chapel.

PARISH CHURCHES. Many of these were of exceptional beauty of composition and detail. They display the greatest

variety of plan, churches with two equal-gabled naves side by side being not uncommon. A considerable proportion of them date from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and are chiefly interesting for their square, single, west towers and their carved wooden ceilings (see below). The tower was usually built over the central western porch; broad and square, with corner buttresses terminating in pinnacles, it was usually finished without spires. Crenelated battlements crowned the upper story. Among notable square towers are those of **Boston** and St. Nicholas, Newcastle. Important parish churches are St. Michael's, Coventry; St. Mary's Redcliffe, at Bristol; St. Stephen's, Norwich, and many others.

SPIRES. When spires were added to the west towers, the transition from the square tower to the octagonal spire was effected by *broaches* or portions of a square pyramid intersecting the base of the spire, or by corner pinnacles and flying-buttresses. The spires of the more important parish churches are often of exceptional beauty, and constitute a notably successful element in English mediæval architecture. Even the simpler broach-spires like Frampton or Ewerby are strikingly effective, while the more elaborate spires of later date, such as Louth, Patrington or **St. Michael's,** Coventry, are architectural works of the first order. The most perfect of all English spires is, however, that of Salisbury Cathedral.

WOODEN CEILINGS. The English treated woodwork with consummate skill. They invented and developed a variety of forms of roof-truss in which the proper distribution of the strains was combined with a highly decorative treatment of the several parts by carving, moulding, and arcading. The ceiling surfaces between the trusses were handled decoratively, and the oaken open-timber ceilings of many of the English churches and civic or academic halls (Christ Church Hall, Oxford; Westminster Hall, London) are such noble and beautiful works as quite to justify the substitution of wooden for vaulted ceilings (Fig. 143).

The *hammer-beam* truss was in its way as highly scientific, and æsthetically as satisfactory, as any feature of French Gothic stone construction. Without the use of tie-rods to keep the rafters from spreading, it brought the strain of the roof upon internal brackets low down on the wall, and produced a beautiful effect by the repetition of its graceful curves in each truss. The ceilings of the parish churches of Wymondham, Trunch, March, St. Stephen's, Norwich, and the Middle Temple Hall, London, are fine examples of this branch of English design.

FIG. 143.—ROOF OF NAVE, ST. MARY'S, WESTON-ZOYLAND.

CHAPELS AND HALLS. Many of these rival the cathedrals in beauty and dignity of design. The royal chapels at Windsor and Westminster have already been mentioned, as well as King's College Chapel at Cambridge, and Christ Church Hall at Oxford. To these college halls should be added the chapel of Merton College at Oxford, and the beautiful chapel of St. Stephen at Westminster, most unfortunately demolished when the present Parliament House was erected. The Lady-chapels of Gloucester and Ely, though connected with the cathedrals, are really independent designs of late date, and remarkable for the richness of their decoration, their great windows, and elaborate ribbed vaulting. Some of the halls in mediæval castles and manor-houses are also worthy of note, especially for their timber ceilings.

MINOR MONUMENTS. The student of Gothic architecture should also give attention to the choir-screens, tombs, and chantries which embellish many of the abbeys and cathedrals. The rood-screen at York is a notable example of the first; the tomb of De Gray in the same cathedral, and tombs and chantries in Canterbury, Winchester, Westminster Abbey, Ely, St. Alban's Abbey, and other churches are deservedly admired. In these the English love for ornament, for minute carving, and for the contrast of white and colored marble, found unrestrained expression. To these should be added the market-crosses of Salisbury and Winchester, and Queen Eleanor's Cross at Waltham.

DOMESTIC ARCHITECTURE. The mediæval castles of Great Britain belong to the domain of military engineering rather than of the history of art, though occasionally presenting to view details of considerable architectural beauty. The growth of peace and civic order is marked by the erection of manor-houses, the residences of wealthy landowners. Some of these houses are of imposing size, and show the application to domestic requirements, of the late Gothic style which prevailed in the period to which most of them belong. The windows are square or Tudor-arched, with stone mullions and transoms of the Perpendicular style, and the walls terminate in merlons or crenelated parapets, recalling the earlier military structures. The palace of the bishop or archbishop, adjoining the cathedral, and the residences of the dean, canons, and clergy, together with the libraries, schools, and gates of the cathedral enclosure, illustrate other phases of secular Gothic work. Few of these structures are of striking architectural merit, but they possess a picturesque charm which is very attractive.

Not many stone houses of the smaller class remain from the Gothic period in England. But there is hardly an old town that does not retain many of the half-timbered dwellings of the fifteenth or even fourteenth century, some of them in excellent preservation. They are for the most part wider and lower than

the French houses of the same class, but are built on the same principle, and, like them, the woodwork is more or less richly carved.

MONUMENTS: (A. = abbey church; C. = cathedral; r. = ruined; trans. = transept; each monument is given under the date of the earliest extant Gothic work upon it, with additions of later periods in parentheses.)

EARLY ENGLISH: Kirkstall A., 1152-82, first pointed arches; Canterbury C., choir, 1175-84 (nave, 1378-1411; central tower, 1500); Wells C., 1190-1206 (W. front 1225, choir later, chapter-h. 1292-1319); Lincoln C., choir, trans., 1192-1200 (vault 1250; nave and E. end 1260-80); Lichfield C., 1200-50 (W. front 1275; presbytery 1325); Rochester C., choir and trans., 1200-39 (nave Norman); Worcester C., choir 1203-18, nave partly Norman (W. end 1375-95); Chichester C., 1204-44 (spire rebuilt 17th century); Fountains A., 1205-46; Salisbury C., 1220-58 (cloister, chapter-h. 1263-84; spire 1331); Elgin C., 1224-44; Beverley A., choir, trans. 1225-1245 (nave 1320-50; W. front 1380-1430); York C., S. trans. 1225; N. trans. 1260 (nave, chapter-h. 1291-1345; W. window 1338; central tower 1389-1407; E. window 1407); Southwell Minster, 1233-94 (nave Norman); Ripon C., 1233-94 (central tower 1459); Ely C., choir 1229-54 (nave Norman; octagon and presbytery 1323-62); Peterborough C., W. front 1237 (nave Norman; retro-choir, late 14th century); Netley A., 1239 (r.); Durham C., "Nine Altars" and E. end choir, 1235-90 (nave, choir, Norman; W. window 1341; central tower finished 1480); Glasgow C. (with remarkable Early English crypt), 1242-77; Gloucester C., nave vaulted 1239-42 (nave mainly Norman; choir 1337-51; cloisters 1375-1412; W. end 1420-37; central tower 1450-57); Westminster A., 1245-69; nave 1350-1422; St. Mary's A., York, 1272-92 (r.).

DECORATED: Merton College Chapel, Oxford, 1274-1300; Hereford C., N. trans., chapter-h., cloisters, vaulting, 1275-92 (nave, choir, Norman); Exeter C., choir, trans., 1279-91; nave 1331-50 (E. end remodelled 1390); Lichfield C., Lady-chapel 1310; Ely C., Lady-chapel, 1321-49; Melrose A., 1327-99 (nave 1500; r.); St. Stephen's chapel, Westminster 1349-64 (demolished); Edington church, 1352-61; Carlisle C., E. end and upper parts 1352-95 (nave in part and S. trans. Norman; tower finished 1419); Winchester C., W. end remodelled 1360-66 (nave and aisles 1394-1410; trans. partly Nor-

man); York C., Lady-chapel 1362-72; churches of Patrington and Hull, late 14th century; St. Mary's Redcliffe at Bristol, 1292-1460.

PERPENDICULAR: Winchester C., nave 1371-1460; Canterbury C., nave 1379-1400; cloister 1397-1412; Holy Cross Church, Canterbury, 1380; St. Mary's Warwick, 1381-91; Manchester C., 1422; St. Mary's, Bury St. Edmunds, 1424-33; Sherborne, choir 1436 (nave 1475-1504); Beauchamp Chapel, Warwick, 1439; King's College Chapel, Cambridge, 1446; vaults 1508-15; Roslyn Chapel, Edinburgh, 1446-90; Gloucester C., Lady-chapel, 1457-98; St. Mary's, Stratford-on-Avon, 1465-91; Norwich C., upper part and E. end of choir, 1472-99 (the rest mainly Norman); St. George's Chapel, Windsor, 1481-1508; choir vaulted, 1507-20; Bath A., 1500-39; Chapel of Henry VII., Westminster, 1503-20; Central towers of York, Lincoln, Gloucester, Durham, Canterbury and Bristol C.; Churches of S. Nicholas, Lynn, St. Michael's, Coventry, Boston, Louth, Malvern Priory and many others.

ACADEMIC AND SECULAR BUILDINGS: Winchester Castle Hall, 1222-35; Merton College Chapel, Oxford, 1274-1300; Library Merton College, 1354-78; Norborough Hall, 1356; Windsor Castle, upper ward, 1359-73; Winchester College, 1387-93; Wardour Castle, 1392; Westminster Hall, rebuilt, 1397-99; St. Mary's Hall, Coventry, 1401-14; Warkworth Castle, 1440; St. John's College, All Souls' College, Oxford, 1437; Eton College, 1441-1522; Divinity Schools, Oxford, 1445-54; Magdalen College, Oxford, 1475-80, tower, 1500; Christ Church Hall, Oxford, 1529.

CHAPTER XVIII.

GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE IN GERMANY, THE NETHERLANDS, AND SPAIN.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: As before, Corroyer, Reber. Also, Adler, *Mittelalterliche Backstein-Bauwerke des preussischen Staates.* Essenwein (*Hdbuch. d. Arch.*), *Die romanische und die gothische Baukunst; der Wohnbau.* Foerster, *Denkmäler deutscher Baukunst.* Hasak, *Die romanische und die gothische Baukunst; Kirchenbau; Einzelheiten des Kirchenbaues* (both in *Hdbuch. d. Arch.*) Hase and others, *Die mittelalterlichen Baudenkmäler Niedersachsens.* Kallenbach, *Chronologie der deutschen mittelalterlichen Baukunst.* Lübke, *Ecclesiastical Art in Germany during the Middle Ages.* Piferrer and Pi y Margall, *España, sus monumentos y artes.* Redtenbacher, *Leitfaden zum Studium der mittelalterlichen Baukunst.* Street, *Gothic Architecture in Spain.* Uhde, *Baudenkmäler in Spanien.* Ungewitter, *Lehrbuch der gothischen Constructionen.* Villa Amil, *Hispania Artistica y Monumental.* Watson, *Portuguese Architecture.*

EARLY GOTHIC WORKS. The Gothic architecture of Germany is less interesting to the general student than that of France and England not only because its development was less systematic and more provincial, but also because it produced fewer works of high intrinsic merit. The introduction into Germany of the pointed style was tardy, and its progress slow. Romanesque architecture had created imposing types of ecclesiastical architecture, which the conservative Teutons were slow to abandon. The result was a half-century of transition and a mingling of Romanesque and Gothic forms. St. Castor, at Coblentz, built as late as 1208, is wholly Romanesque. Even when the pointed

arch and vault had finally come into general use, the plan and the constructive system still remained predominantly Romanesque. The western apse and short sanctuary of the earlier plans were retained. There was no triforium, the clearstory was insignificant, and the whole aspect low and massive. The Germans avoided, at first, as did the English, the constructive audacities and difficulties of the French Gothic, but showed less of invention and grace than their English neighbors. When, however, through the influence of foreign models, especially of the great French cathedrals, and through the employment of foreign architects, the Gothic styles were at last thoroughly domesticated, a spirit of ostentation took the place of the earlier conservatism. Technical cleverness, exaggerated ingenuity of detail, and constructive *tours de force* characterize most of the German Gothic work of the late fourteenth and of the fifteenth century. This is exemplified in the slender mullions of Ulm, the lofty and complicated spire of Strasburg, and the curious traceries of churches and houses in Nuremberg.

PERIODS. The stages of German mediæval architectural development corresponded in sequence, though not in date, with the movement elsewhere. The maturing of the true Gothic styles was preceded by more than a half-century of transition. Chronologically the periods* may be broadly stated as follows:

The TRANSITIONAL, 1170–1225.

The EARLY POINTED, 1225–1275.

The MIDDLE OR DECORATED, 1275–1350.

The FLORID, 1350–1530.

These divisions are, however, far less clearly defined than in France and England. The development of forms was less logical and consequential, and less uniform in the different provinces, than in those western lands.

CONSTRUCTION. As already remarked, a tenacious hold of Romanesque methods is observable in many German Gothic

* See *ante*, p. 197.

monuments. Broad wall-surfaces with small windows and a general massiveness and lowness of proportions were long preferred to the more slender and lofty forms of true Gothic design. Square vaulting-bays were persistently adhered to, covering two aisle-bays. The six-part system was only rarely resorted to, as at Schlettstadt, and in St. George at Limburg-on-the-Lahn (Fig. 144). The ribbed vault was an imported idea, and was never systematically developed. Under the final dominance of French models in the second half of the thirteenth century, vaulting in oblong bays became more general, powerfully influenced by buildings like Freiburg, Cologne, and Ratisbon Cathedrals, and St. Catherine at Oppenheim. In the fourteenth century the growing taste for elaboration and rich detail led to the introduction of multiplied decorative ribs, not, as in England, through a logical development of constructive methods, but purely as decorative features. Conspicuous examples of its application are found in the cathedrals of Freiburg, Ulm, Prague, and Vienna; in St. Barbara at Kuttenberg, and many other important churches. But with all the richness and complexity of these net-like vaults the Germans developed nothing like the fan-vaulting or chapter-house ceilings of England.



FIG. 144.—ONE BAY OF CATHEDRAL OF ST. GEORGE, LIMBURG.

SIDE AISLES. A notable feature of many German churches is the raising of the side-aisle vaults to the same height as that of the central aisle. Thus was developed a distinctly new type, to

which German writers have given the name of *hall-church*. The result was to transform completely the internal perspective of the church as well as its structural membering. The clearstory disappeared; the central aisle no longer dominated the interior; the pier-arches and side-walls were greatly increased in height, and flying-buttresses were no longer required. The whole design appeared internally more spacious, but lost greatly in variety and in interest. The cathedral of **St. Stephen** at Vienna is the most imposing instance of this treatment, which first appeared in the church of St. Elizabeth at Marburg (1235–83; Fig. 145). St. Barbara at Kuttenberg, St. Martin's at Landshut (1404), the Frauenkirche of Munich, St. Catherine at Brandenburg, the Abbey at Zwettl and the Cathedral of Stendal, are others among many examples of this type.



FIG. 145.—SECTION OF ST. ELIZABETH, MARBURG.

TOWERS AND SPIRES. The same fondness for spires which had been displayed in the Rhenish Romanesque churches produced in the Gothic period a number of strikingly beautiful church steeply, in which openwork tracery was substituted for the solid stone pyramids of earlier examples. The most remarkable of these spires are those of Freiburg (1300), Strasburg, and Cologne Cathedrals, of the church at Esslingen, St. Martin's at Landshut, and the Cathedral of Vienna. In these the transition from the simple square tower below to the octagonal belfry and spire is generally managed with skill. In the remarkable tower of the cathedral at Vienna (1433) the transition is too gradual, so

that the spire seems to start from the ground and lacks the vigor and accent of a simpler square lower portion. The over-elaborate spire of **Strasburg** (1429, by Junckher of Cologne; lower parts and façade, 1277–1365, by *Erwin von Steinbach* and his sons) reaches a height of 468 feet; the spires of Cologne, completed in 1883 from the original fourteenth-century drawings, long lost but recovered by a happy accident, are 500 feet high. The spires of **Ratisbon** and **Ulm** have also been recently completed in the original style.

DETAILS. German window tracery was best where it most closely followed French patterns, but it tended always towards the faults of mechanical stiffness and of technical display in over-slenderness of shafts and mullions. The windows, especially in the "hall-churches," were apt to be too narrow for their height. In the fifteenth century ingenuity of geometrical combinations took the place of grace of line, and later the tracery was often tortured into a stone caricature of rustic-work of interlaced and twisted boughs and twigs, represented with all their bark and knots (*branch-tracery*). The execution was far superior to the design. A favorite device for the display of technical skill was the carving of intersecting mouldings. The carving of foliage in capitals, finials, etc., calls for no special mention for its originality or its departure from French types.

PLANS. In these there was more variety than in any other part of Europe except Italy. Some churches, like Naumburg, retained the Romanesque system of a second western apse and short choir. The Cistercian churches generally had square east ends, while the polygonal eastern apse without ambulatory is seen in St. Elizabeth at Marburg; the Minster at Ulm, the cathedrals of Ratisbon and Vienna, and many other churches. The earliest example of the chevet with a single ambulatory and a series of radiating apsidal chapels was **Madgeburg** Cathedral (1208–11), later followed by Altenburg, Cologne, Freiburg, Lübeck, Prague and Zwettl, St. Francis at Salzburg and some other churches.

Side chapels to nave or choir appear in the cathedrals of Lübeck, Munich, Oppenheim, Prague and Zwettl. **Cologne Cathedral,** by far the largest and most magnificent of all, is completely French in plan, uniting in one design the leading characteristics of the most notable French churches (Fig. 146). It has complete double aisles in both nave and choir, three-aisled transepts, radial chevet-chapels and twin western towers. The ambulatory is, however, single, and there are no lateral chapels. A typical German treatment was the eastward termination of the church by polygonal chapels, one in the axis of each aisle, the central one projecting beyond its neighbors. Where there were five aisles, as at Xanten, the effect was particularly fine. The plan of the curious polygonal church of **Our Lady** (Liebfrauenkirche; 1227–43) built on the site of the ancient circular baptistery at Treves, would seem to have been produced by doubling such an arrangement on either side of the transverse axis (Fig. 147).



FIG. 146.—COLOGNE CATHEDRAL. PLAN.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT. The so-called **Golden Portal** of **Freiburg** in the Erzgebirge is perhaps the first distinctively Gothic work in Germany, dating from 1190. From that time on, Gothic details appeared with increasing frequency, especially in the Rhine provinces, as shown in many transitional structures. **Gelnhausen** and Aschaffenburg are early thirteenth century examples; pointed arches and vaults appear in the Apostles' and St. Martin's churches at Cologne; and the great

church of **St. Peter and St. Paul** at Neuweiler in Alsace has an almost purely Gothic nave of the same period. The churches of **Bamberg, Fritzlar,** and **Naumburg,** and in Westphalia those of **Münster** and **Osnabrück,** are important examples of the transition. The French influence, especially the Burgundian, appears as early as 1212 in the cathedral of **Madgeburg,** imitating the choir of Soissons, and in the structural design of the Liebfrauenkirche at Treves, as already mentioned; it reached complete ascendancy in Alsace at **Strasburg** (nave 1240–75), in Baden at **Freiburg** (nave 1270), and in Prussia at **Cologne** (1248–1320). Strasburg Cathedral is especially remarkable for its façade, the work of Erwin von Steinbach and his sons (1277–1346), designed after French models, and its north spire, built in the fifteenth century. Cologne Cathedral was begun in 1248 in imitation of the newly completed choir of Amiens, and the choir was consecrated in 1322. The nave and W. front were partly built during the first half of the fourteenth century, though the towers were not completed till 1883. In spite of its vast size and slow construction, it is in style the most uniform of all great Gothic cathedrals, as it is the most lofty (excepting the choir of Beauvais) and the largest excepting Milan and Seville. Unfortunately its details, though pure and correct, are singularly dry and mechanical, while its very uniformity deprives it of the picturesque and varied charm which results from a mixture of styles recording the labors of successive generations. The same criticism may be raised against the late minster of **Ulm** (choir, 1377–1449;



FIG. 147.—CHURCH OF OUR LADY, TREVES.

nave, 1477; Fig. 148). The Cologne influence is observable in the widely separated cathedrals of Utrecht in the Netherlands, Metz in the W., Minden and **Halberstadt** (begun 1250; mainly built after 1327) in Saxony, and in the S. in the church of **St. Catherine** at Oppenheim. To the E. and S., in the cathedrals of **Prague** (Bohemia) by *Matthew of Arras* (1344–52) and **Ratisbon** (or Regensburg, 1275), the French influence predominates, at least in the details and construction. The last-named is one of the most dignified and beautiful of German Gothic churches —German in plan, French in execution. The French influence also manifests itself in the details of many of the peculiarly German churches with aisles of equal height (see p. 244).



FIG. 148.—PLAN OF MINSTER OF ULM.

More peculiarly German are the brick churches of North Germany, where stone was almost wholly lacking. In these, flat walls, square towers, and decoration by colored tiles and bricks are characteristic, as at Brandenburg (St. Godehard and **St. Catherine,** 1346–1400), at **Prentzlau,** Tängermünde, Königsberg, etc. Lübeck possesses notable monuments of brick architecture in the churches of **St. Mary** and St. Catherine, both much alike in plan and in the flat and barren simplicity of their exteriors. **St. Martin's** at **Landshut** in the South is also a notable brick church.

LATE GOTHIC. As in France and England, the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were mainly occupied with the completion of existing churches, many of which, up to that time, were still without naves. The complicated ribbed vaults of this period are among its most striking features (see p. 244). Spire-building was as general as was the erection of central square towers in

England, during the same period. To this time also belong the overloaded traceries and minute detail of the **St. Sebald** and St. Lorenz churches and Frauenkirche, and of several secular buildings, all at Nuremberg, the façade of Chemnitz Cathedral, and similar works. The nave and tower of St. Stephen at Vienna (1359–1433), the church of Sta. Maria in Gestade in the same city, and the cathedral of Kaschau in Hungary, are Austrian masterpieces of late Gothic design.

SECULAR BUILDINGS. Germany possesses a number of important examples of secular Gothic work, chiefly municipal buildings (gates and town halls) and castles. The first completely Gothic castle or palace was not built until 1280, at **Marienburg** (Prussia), and was completed a century later. It consists of two courts, the earlier of the two forming a closed square and containing the chapel and chapter-house of the Order of the German Knights. The later and larger court is less regular, its chief feature being the **Great Hall** of the Order, in two aisles. All the vaulting is of the richest multiple-ribbed type. Other castles are at Marienwerder, Heilsberg (1350) in E. Prussia, Karlstein in Bohemia (1347), and the **Albrechtsburg** at Meissen in Saxony (1471–83).

Among town halls, most of which date from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, may be mentioned those of Ratisbon (Regensburg), Münster and Hildesheim, Halberstadt, **Brunswick,** Lübeck, and Bremen—the last two of brick. These, and the city gates, such as the **Spahlenthor** at Basle (Switzerland) and others at Lübeck and Wismar, are generally very picturesque edifices. Many fine guildhalls were also built during the last two centuries of the Gothic style; and dwelling-houses of the same period, of quaint and effective design, with stepped or traceried gables, lofty roofs, openwork balconies and corner turrets, are to be found in many cities. Nuremberg is especially rich in these.

THE NETHERLANDS, as might be expected from their position, underwent the influences of both France and Germany.

During the thirteenth century, largely through the intimate monastic relations between Tournay and Noyon, the French influence became paramount in what is now Belgium, while Holland remained more strongly German in style. Of the two countries Belgium developed by far the most interesting architecture. The Flemish town halls and guildhalls merit particular attention for their size and richness, exemplifying in a worthy manner the wealth and independence of the Flemish weavers and merchants in the fifteenth century.

CATHEDRALS AND CHURCHES. The earliest purely Gothic edifice in Belgium was the choir of **Ste. Gudule** (1225) at Brussels, followed in 1242 by the choir and transepts of **Tournay,** designed with pointed vaults, side chapels, and a complete *chevet.* The transept-ends are round, as at Noyon. It was surpassed in splendor by the **Cathedral** of **Antwerp** (1352–1422), remarkable for its seven-aisled nave and narrow transepts. It covers some 70,000 square feet, but its great size is not as effective internally as it should be, owing to the poverty of the details and the lack of finely felt proportion in the various parts. The late west front (1422–1518) displays the florid taste of the wealthy Flemish burgher population of that period, but is so rich and elegant, especially its lofty and slender north spire, that its over-decoration is pardonable. The cathedral of **St. Rombaut** at Malines (choir, 1336; nave, 1454–64) is a more satisfactory church, though smaller and with its western towers incomplete. The cathedral of **Louvain** belongs to the same period (1373–1433). **St. Wandru** at Mons (1450–1528) and **St. Jacques** at Liège (1522–58) are interesting parish churches of the first rank, remarkable especially for the use of color in their internal decoration, for their late tracery and ribbed vaulting, and for the absence of Renaissance details at that late period.

TOWN HALLS: GUILDHALLS. These were really the most characteristic Flemish edifices, and are in most cases the most conspicuous monuments of their respective cities. The **Cloth**

Hall of **Ypres** (1304) is the earliest and most imposing among them; similar halls were built not much later at **Bruges, Malines** and **Ghent.** The town halls were mostly of later date, the earliest being that of **Bruges** (1377). The town halls of **Brussels** with its imposing and graceful tower, of **Louvain** (1448–63; Fig. 149) and of **Oudenärde** (early sixteenth century) are conspicuous monuments of this class. The town hall of **Middelburg,** Holland, belongs also in this group.



FIG. 149.—TOWN HALL, LOUVAIN.

In general, the Gothic architecture of Belgium presents the traits of a borrowed style, which did not undergo at the hands of its borrowers any radically novel or fundamental development. The structural design is usually lacking in vigor and organic significance, but the details are often graceful and well designed, especially on the exterior. The tendency was often towards over-elaboration, particularly in the later works.

The Gothic architecture of **Holland** and of the **Scandinavian** countries offers so little that is highly artistic or inspiring in character, that space cannot well be given in this work even to an enumeration of its chief monuments.

SPAIN AND PORTUGAL. The beginnings of Gothic architecture in Spain followed close on the series of campaigns from 1217

to 1252, which began the overthrow of the Moorish dominion. With the resulting spirit of exultation and the wealth accruing from booty, came a rapid development of architecture, mainly under French influence. Gothic architecture was at this date, under St. Louis, producing in France some of its noblest works. The great cathedrals of **Toledo** and **Burgos,** begun between 1220 and 1230, were the earliest purely Gothic churches in Spain. **San Vincente** at Avila and the **Old Cathedral** at Salamanca, of somewhat earlier date, present a mixture of round- and pointed-arched forms, with the Romanesque elements predominant (see page 182). **Toledo Cathedral,** planned in imitation of Notre Dame and Bourges, but exceeding them in width, covers 75,000 square feet, and thus ranks among the largest of European cathedrals. Internally it is well proportioned and well detailed, recalling the early French masterworks, but its exterior is less commendable.

FIG. 150.—FAÇADE OF BURGOS CATHEDRAL.

In the contemporary cathedral of Burgos the exterior is at least as interesting as the interior. The west front, of German design, suggests Cologne by its twin openwork spires (Fig. 150); while the crossing is embellished with a sumptuous dome and lantern or *cimborio*, added as late as 1567. The chapels at the east end, especially that of the Condestabile (1487), are ornate to the point

of overloading, a fault to which late Spanish Gothic work is peculiarly prone. Other thirteenth-century cathedrals are those of **Leon** (1260), **Valencia** (1262), and **Barcelona** (1298), all exhibiting strongly the French influence in the plan, vaulting and vertical proportions. The models of Bourges and Paris with their wide naves, lateral chapels and semicircular chevets were followed in the cathedral of Barcelona, in a number of fourteenth-century churches both there and elsewhere, and in the sixteenth-century cathedral of Segovia. In Sta. Maria del Pi at Barcelona, in the collegiate church at Manresa, and in the imposing nave of the **Cathedral** of **Gerona** (1416, added to the choir of 1312, the latter by a Southern French architect, Henri de Narbonne), the influence of Alby in southern France (see p. 209) is discernible. These are one-aisled churches with internal buttresses separating the lateral chapels. The nave of Gerona is 73 feet wide, or double the average clear width of French or English cathedral naves. The resulting effect is not commensurate with the actual dimensions, and shows the inappropriateness of Gothic details for compositions so Roman in breadth and simplicity.

SEVILLE. The largest single edifice in Spain, and the largest church built during the Middle Ages in Europe, is the **Cathedral** of **Seville,** begun in 1401 on the site of a Moorish mosque. It covers 124,000 square feet, measuring 415×298 feet, and is a simple rectangle comprising five aisles with lateral chapels. The central aisle is 56 feet wide and 145 high; the side aisles and chapels diminish gradually in height, and with the uniform piers in six rows produce an imposing effect, in spite of the lack of transepts or chevet. The somewhat similar **New Cathedral** of Salamanca (1510–1560) shows the last struggles of the Gothic style against the incoming tide of the Renaissance.

LATER MONUMENTS. These all partake of the over-decoration which characterized the fifteenth century throughout Europe. In Spain this decoration was even less constructive in character, and more purely fanciful and arbitrary, than in the

northern lands; but this very rejection of all constructive pretense gives it a peculiar charm and goes far to excuse its extravagance (Fig. 151). Decorative vaulting-ribs were made to describe geometric patterns of great elegance. Some of the late Gothic vaults by the very exuberance of imagination shown in their designs, almost disarm criticism. Instead of suppressing the walls as far as possible, and emphasizing all the vertical lines, as was done in France and England, the later Gothic architects of Spain delighted in broad wall-surfaces and multiplied horizontal lines. Upon these surfaces they lavished carving without restraint and without any organic relation to the structure of the building. The arcades of cloisters and interior courts (*patios*) were formed with arches of fantastic curves resting on twisted columns; and internal chapels in the cathedrals were covered with minute carving of exquisite workmanship, but wholly irrational design. Probably the influence of Moorish decorative art accounts in part for these extravagances.

FIG. 151.—DETAIL, PORTAL S. GREGORIO, VALLADOLID.

The eastern chapels in Burgos Cathedral, the votive church of **San Juan de los Reyes** (1476) at Toledo and many portals of churches, convents and hospitals illustrate these tendencies.

PORTUGAL is an almost unknown land architecturally. It seems to have adopted the Gothic styles very late in its history. Two monuments, however, are conspicuous, the convent churches of **Batalha** (1390–1520) and **Belem,** both marked by an extreme overloading of carved ornament. The **Mausoleum of King Manoel** in the rear of the church at Batalha is, however, a noble creation, possibly by an English master. It is a polygonal domed edifice, some 67 feet in diameter, and well designed, though covered with a too profuse and somewhat mechanical decoration of panels, pinnacles, and carving.

MONUMENTS: GERMANY (C = cathedral; A = abbey; tr. = transepts).—13th century: Transitional churches: Bamberg C.; Naumburg C.; Collegiate Church, Fritzlar; St. George, Limburg-on-Lahn; St. Castor, Coblentz; Heisterbach A.;—all in early years of 13th century. St. Gereon, Cologne, choir 1212-27; Liebfrauenkirche, Treves, 1227-44; St. Elizabeth, Marburg, 1235-83; Sts. Peter and Paul, Neuweiler, 1250; Cologne C., choir 1248-1322 (nave 14th century; towers finished 1883); Strasburg C., 1250-75 (E. end Romanesque; façade 1277-1365; tower 1429-39); Halberstadt C., nave 1250 (choir 1327; completed 1490); Altenburg C., choir 1255-65 (finished 1379); Wimpfen-im-Thal church 1259-78; St. Lawrence, Nuremberg, 1260 (choir 1439-77); St. Catherine, Oppenheim, 1262-1317 (choir 1439); Xanten, Collegiate Church, 1263; Freiburg C., 1270 (W. tower 1300; choir 1354); Toul C., 1272; Meissen C., choir 1274 (nave 1312-42); Ratisbon C., 1275; St. Mary's, Lübeck, 1276; Dominican churches at Coblentz, Gebweiler; and in Switzerland at Basle, Berne, and Zürich.—14th century: Wiesenkirche, Söst, 1313; Osnabrück C., 1318 (choir 1420); St. Mary's, Prentzlau, 1325; Augsburg C., 1321-1431; Metz C., 1330 rebuilt (choir 1486); St. Stephen's C., Vienna, 1340 (nave 15th century; tower 1433); Zwettl C., 1343; Prague C., 1344; church at Thann, 1351 (tower finished 16th century); Liebfrauenkirche, Nuremberg, 1355-61; St. Sebaldus Church, Nuremberg, 1361-77 (nave Romanesque); Minden C., choir 1361; Minster at Ulm, 1377 (choir

1449; nave vaulted 1471; finished 16th century); Sta. Barbara, Kuttenberg, 1386 (nave 1483); Erfurt C.; St. Elizabeth, Kaschau; Schlettstadt C.—15th century: St. Catherine's, Brandenburg, 1401; Frauenkirche, Esslingen, 1406 (finished 1522); Minster at Berne, 1421; Peter-Paulskirche, Görlitz, 1423-97; St. Mary's, Stendal, 1447; Frauenkirche, Munich, 1468-88; St. Martin's, Landshut, 1473.

Secular Monuments: Schloss Marienburg, 1341; Moldaubridge and tower, Prague, 1344; Karlsteinburg, 1348-57; Albrechtsburg, Meissen, 1471-83; Nassau House, Nuremberg, 1350; College of the Jagellons, Prague, late 15th century; Council houses (Rathhaüser) at Nuremburg, 1340; Brunswick, 1393; Cologne, 1407-15; Basle; Breslau; Lübeck; Münster; Prague; Ulm; City Gates of Basle, Cologne, Ingolstadt, Lucerne.

The Netherlands: Brussels C. (Ste. Gudule), 1226-80; Tournai C., choir 1242 (nave finished 1380); Notre Dame, Bruges, 1239-97; Notre Dame, Tongres, 1240; Utrecht C., 1251; St. Martin, Ypres, 1254; Notre Dame, Dinant, 1255; church at Dordrecht; church at Aerschot, 1337; Antwerp C., 1352-1411 (W. front 1422-1518); St. Rombaut, Malines, 1355-66 (nave 1456-64); St. Wandru, Mons, 1450-1528; St. Lawrence, Rotterdam, 1472; other 15th century churches—St. Bavon, Haarlem; St. Catherine, Utrecht; St. Walpurgis, Sutphen; St. Bavon, Ghent (tower 1461); St. Jacques, Antwerp; St. Pierre, Louvain; St. Jacques, Bruges; churches at Arnheim, Breda, Delft; St. Jacques, Liège, 1522.

Secular; Cloth-hall, Ypres, 1200-1304; cloth-hall, Bruges, 1284; town hall, Bruges, 1377; town hall, Brussels, 1401-55; town hall, Louvain, 1448-63; town hall, Ghent, 1481; town hall, Oudenärde, 1527; Ständehuis, Delft, 1528; cloth-halls at Louvain, Ghent, Malines.

Spain: 13th century: Burgos C., 1221 (façade 1442-56; chapels 1487; cimborio 1567); Toledo C., 1227-90 (chapels 14th and 15th centuries); Tarragona C., 1235; Leon C., 1250 (façade 14th century); Valencia C., 1262 (N. transept 1350-1404; façade 1381-1418); Avila C., vault and N. portal 1292-1353 (finished 14th century); St. Esteban, Burgos; church at Las Huelgas.—14th century: Barcelona C., choir 1298-1329 (nave and transepts 1448; façade 16th century); Gerona C., 1312-46 (nave added 1416); S. M. del Mar, Barcelona, 1328-83; S. M. del Pino, Barcelona, same date; Collegiate Church, Manresa, 1328; Oviedo C., 1388 (tower very late); Pampluna C., 1397 (mainly 15th century).—15th century:

Seville C., 1403 (finished 16th century; cimborio 1517-67); La Seo, Saragossa (finished 1505); S. Pablo, Burgos, 1415-35; El Parral, Segovia, 1459; San Pablo, Valladolid, 1463; Astorga C., 1471; San Juan de los Reyes, Toledo, 1476; Carthusian church, Miraflores, 1488; San Juan, and La Merced, Burgos.—16th century: Huesca C., 1515; Salamanca New Cathedral, 1510-60; Segovia C., 1522; S. Juan de la Puerta, Zamorra.

Secular: Porta Serraños, Valencia, 1349; Casa Consistorial, Barcelona, 1369-78; Casa de la Disputacion, same city; Casa de las Lonjas, Valencia, 1482.

Portugal: Alcobaça A., nave 1211 (choir 1158, Romanesque); cloister 1310; Sé A. at Evora, 1185-1211; cloister 14th century; churches at Coimbra, Santarem, Thomar; Guarda C., 15th century; at Batalha, church of Sta. Maria de Victoria and mausoleum of King Manoel, 1387-1515; at Belem, monastery, late Gothic.

CHAPTER XIX.

GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE IN ITALY.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: As before, Corroyer, Reber. Also, Cummings, *A History of Architecture in Italy.* De Fleury, *La Toscane au moyen âge.* Gruner, *The Terra Cotta Architecture of Northern Italy.* Mothes, *Die Baukunst des Mittelalters in Italien.* Norton, *Historical Studies of Church Building in the Middle Ages.* Osten, *Bauwerke der Lombardei.* Ruskin, *Stones of Venice.* Street, *Brick and Marble Architecture of Italy.* Willis, *Remarks on the Architecture of the Middle Ages, especially of Italy.*

GENERAL CHARACTER. The various Romanesque styles which had grown up in Italy before 1200 lacked that unity of principle out of which alone a new and homogeneous national style could have been evolved. Each province practised its own style and methods of building, long after the Romanesque had given place to the Gothic in Western Europe. The Italians cared little for Gothic structural principles. Their predilection for walls, for broad spaces and large units, and for small rather than large windows, was in every respect opposed to the tendencies of Gothic design, and architecture was for them an art of decorative rather than of constructive logic. Provided they could secure spaces for mosaic and wall-painting, they were content to tie their vaults with unsightly tie-rods and to make their church façades mere screen-walls, in form wholly unrelated to the buildings behind them.

When, therefore, under foreign influences pointed arches, tracery, clustered shafts, crockets, and finials came into use, it was merely as an imported fashion. Even when foreign architects

(usually Germans) were employed, the composition, and in large measure the details, were still Italian and provincial. The church of St. Francis of Assisi (1228–53, by *Jacobus of Meran*, a German, superseded later by an Italian, Campello), and the cathedral of Milan (begun 1389, perhaps by *Henry of Gmünd*), are conspicuous illustrations of this. Rome built basilicas all through the Middle Ages. Tuscany continued to prefer flat walls veneered with marble to the broken surfaces and deep buttresses of France and Germany. Venice developed a Gothic style of façade-design wholly her own (see p. 273). Nowhere but in Italy could two such utterly diverse structures as the Certosa at Pavia and the cathedral at Milan have been erected at the same time.

CLIMATE AND TRADITION. Two further causes militated against the domestication of Gothic art in Italy. The first was the brilliant climate, which seems to demand cool, dim interiors, thick walls, and small windows, instead of the vast traceried windows of Gothic design. The second obstacle was the persistence of classic traditions, both in construction and decoration. The spaciousness and breadth of interior planning which characterized Roman design, and its amplitude of scale in every feature, seem never to have lost their hold on the Italians. The narrow lofty aisles, multiplied supports and minute detail of the Gothic style were repugnant to the classic predilections of the Italian builders. The Roman acanthus and Corinthian capital were constantly imitated in their Gothic buildings, and the round arch continued all through the Middle Ages to be used in conjunction with the pointed arch (Figs. 152, 153).

EARLY BUILDINGS. Gothic forms were first introduced into Italy through the agency of the monastic orders, especially the Cistercian. The churches and some other buildings of the Cistercian monasteries of Casamari, **Fossanova** and San Galgano betray unmistakably in their interior design the hand of French builders. They date from the early years of the thirteenth century. The Certosa at Chiaravalle near Milan (1208–21) and

most of the churches erected by the mendicant orders of the Franciscans (founded 1210) and Dominicans (1216) were built with ribbed vaults and pointed arches. The example set by these orders contributed greatly to the general adoption of the foreign style. **S. Francesco** at **Assisi,** already mentioned, was the first Gothic Franciscan church, although **S. Francesco** at **Bologna,** begun a few years later, was finished a little earlier. The Dominican church of **SS. Giovanni e Paolo** and the great Franciscan church of **Sta. Maria Gloriosa dei Frari,** both at Venice, were built a little later. **Sta. Maria Novella** at Florence (1278), and **Sta. Maria sopra Minerva** at Rome (1280), both by the brothers *Sisto* and *Ristoro*, and **S. Anastasia** at Verona (1261) are the masterpieces of the Dominican builders. **S. Andrea** at **Vercelli** in North Italy, begun in 1219 under a foreign architect, is an isolated early example of lay Gothic work. Though somewhat English in its plan, and (unlike most Italian churches) provided with two western spires in the English manner, it is in all other respects thoroughly Italian in aspect. The church at Asti, begun in 1229, suggests German models by its high side walls and narrow windows.



FIG. 152.—DUOMO AT FLORENCE. PLAN.
a, Campanile.

CATHEDRALS. The greatest monuments of Italian Gothic design are the cathedrals, in which, even more than was the case in France, the highly developed civic pride of the municipalities expressed itself. Chief among these half civic, half religious monuments are the cathedrals of **Sienna** (begun in 1243), **Arezzo**

(1278), **Orvieto** (1290), **Florence** (the **Duomo,** Sta. Maria del Fiore, begun 1294 by Arnolfo di Cambio*), **Lucca** (S. Martino, 1350), **Milan** (1389–1418), and **S. Petronio** at Bologna (1390). They are all of imposing size; Milan is the largest of all Gothic cathedrals except Seville. S. Petronio was planned to be 600 feet long, the present structure with its three broad aisles and flanking chapels being merely the nave of the intended edifice. The Duomo at Florence (Fig. 153) is 500 feet long and covers 82,000 square feet; the nave has a span of 60 feet, while the octagon at the crossing is 143 feet in diameter. The effect of these colossal dimensions is, however, as in a number of these large Italian interiors, singularly belittled by the bareness of the walls, by the great size of the constituent parts of the composition, and by the lack of architectural subdivisions and multiplied detail to serve as a scale by which to gauge the scale of the *ensemble*.

FIG. 153.—NAVE OF DUOMO AT FLORENCE.

INTERIOR TREATMENT. It was doubtless intended to cover these large unbroken wall-surfaces and the vast expanse of the vaults over naves of extraordinary breadth with paintings and color decoration. This would have remedied their present

* Called by Vasari "Arnolfo di Lapo."

nakedness and lack of interest, but it was only in a very few instances carried out. The double church of S. Francesco at Assisi, decorated by Cimabue, Giotto, and other early Tuscan painters, the Arena Chapel at Padua, painted by Giotto, the **Spanish Chapel** of S. M. Novella, Florence, and the east end of S. Croce, Florence, are illustrations of the splendor of effect possible by this method of decoration. The bareness of effect in other, unpainted interiors was emphasized by the plainness of the vaults destitute of minor ribs. The transverse ribs were usually broad arches with flat soffits, and the vaulting was often sprung from so low a point as to leave no room for a triforium. Mere bull's-eyes often served for clearstory windows, as in S. Anastasia at Verona, S. Petronio at Bologna, and the Florentine Duomo. The cathedral of **S. Martino** at Lucca (Fig. 154) is one of the most complete and elegant of Italian Gothic interiors, having a genuine triforium with traceried arches. Even here, however, there are round arches without mouldings, flat pilasters, broad transverse ribs recalling Roman arches, and insignificant bull's-eyes in the clearstory.

FIG. 154.—ONE BAY, NAVE OF CATHEDRAL OF SAN MARTINO, LUCCA.

The failure to produce adequate results of scale in the interiors of the larger Italian churches has been already alluded to. It is strikingly exemplified in the Duomo at Florence, the nave of which is 60 feet wide, with four pier-arches each over 55 feet in span. The immense vault, in square bays, starts from the level of the tops of these arches.

The interior (Fig. 153) is singularly naked and cold, giving no conception of its vast dimensions. The colossal dome is an early work of the Renaissance (see p. 280). It is not known how *Fr. Talenti*, who in 1357 enlarged and vaulted the nave and planned the east end, proposed to cover the great octagon. The east end is the most effective part of the design both internally and externally, owing to the relatively moderate scale of the fifteen chapels which surround the apsidal arms of the cross. In S. Petronio at Bologna, begun 1390 by *Master Antonio*, the scale is better handled. The nave, 300 feet long, is divided into six bays, each embracing two side chapels. It is 46 feet wide and 132 feet high, proportions which approximate those of the French cathedrals, and produce an impression of size somewhat unusual in Italian churches.



FIG. 155.—INTERIOR OF SIENNA CATHEDRAL.

Orvieto has internally little that suggests Gothic architecture; like many Franciscan and Dominican churches it is really a timber-roofed basilica with a few pointed windows. The mixed Gothic and Romanesque interior of **Sienna Cathedral** (Fig. 155), with its round arches and six-sided dome, unsymmetrically placed over the crossing, is one of the most impressive creations of Italian mediæval art. Alternate courses of black and white marble add richness but not repose to the effect of this interior: the same is true of Orvieto, and of some other churches. The basement baptistery of **S. Giovanni,** under the

east end of Sienna Cathedral, is much more purely Gothic in detail.

In these, and indeed in most Italian interiors, the main interest centres less in the excellence of the composition than in the accessories of pavements, pulpits, choir-stalls, and sepulchral monuments. In these the decorative fancy and skill of the Italians found unrestrained exercise, and produced works of surpassing interest and merit.

EXTERNAL DESIGN. The greatest possible disparity generally exists between the sides and west fronts of the Italian churches. With few exceptions the flanks present nothing like the variety of sky-line and of light and shade customary in northern and western lands. The side walls are high and flat, plain, or striped with black and white masonry (Sienna, Orvieto), or veneered with marble (Duomo at Florence) or decorated with surface-ornament of thin pilasters and arcades (Lucca). The clearstory is low; the roof low-pitched and hardly visible from below. Color, rather than structural richness, is generally sought for: Milan Cathedral is almost the only exception, and goes to the other extreme, with its seemingly countless buttresses, pinnacles and statues.

The façades, on the other hand, were treated as independent decorative compositions, and were in many cases remarkably beautiful works, though having little or no organic relation to the main structure. The most celebrated are those of **Sienna** (cathedral begun 1243; façade 1284, by *Giovanni Pisano;* Fig. 156) and **Orvieto** (begun 1290, by *Lorenzo Maitani;* façade 1310). Both of these are sumptuous polychromatic compositions in marble, designed on somewhat similar lines, with three high gables fronting the three aisles, with deeply recessed portals, pinnacled turrets flanking nave and aisles, and a central circular window. That of Orvieto is furthermore embellished with mosaic pictures, and is the more brilliant in color of the two. The mediæval façades of the Florentine Gothic churches were never completed;

but the elegance of the panelling and of the tracery with twisted shafts in the flanks of the cathedral and the florid beauty of its side doorways (late fourteenth century) would doubtless if realized with equal success on the façades have produced strikingly beautiful results. The modern façade of the Duomo, by the late *De Fabris* (1887) is a correct if not highly imaginative version of the style so applied. The front of Milan Cathedral shows a mixture of Gothic and Renaissance forms, having been completed only in the early nineteenth century.* **Ferrara Cathedral,** although internally transformed in the last century, retains its picturesque but utterly illogical thirteenth-century three-gabled and arcaded screen front. The **Cathedral** of **Genoa** presents Gothic windows and deeply recessed portals in a façade built in black and white bands, like Sienna Cathedral and many churches in Pistoia and Pisa.

FIG. 156.—FAÇADE OF SIENNA CATHEDRAL.

Externally the most important feature was frequently a cupola or dome over the crossing. That of Sienna has already been mentioned; that of Milan is a sumptuous many-pinnacled structure terminating in a spire 300 feet high. The **Certosa** at Pavia (Fig. 157) and the earlier Carthusian church of Chiaravalle have

* The proposed new Gothic façade designed by Brentano (d. 1889) has never been carried out.

internal cupolas or domes covered externally by many-storied structures ending in a tower dominating the whole edifice. These two churches, like many others in Lombardy, the Æmilia and Venetia, are built of brick, moulded terra-cotta being effectively used for the cornices, string-courses, jambs and ornaments of the exterior. The Certosa at Pavia (1396) is contemporary with the cathedral of Milan, to which it offers a surprising contrast, both in

FIG. 157.—EXTERIOR OF THE CERTOSA, PAVIA.

style and material. It is wholly built of brick and terra-cotta, and, save for its ribbed vaulting, possesses hardly a single Gothic feature or detail. Its arches, mouldings, and cloisters suggest both the Romanesque and the Renaissance styles by their semi-classic character.

PLANS. The wide diversity of local styles in Italian architecture appears in the plans as strikingly as in the details. In general one notes a love of spaciousness which expresses itself in a sometimes disproportionate breadth, and in the wide spacing of

the piers. The polygonal chevet with its radial chapels is but rarely seen; **S. Lorenzo** at Naples, Sta. Maria dei Servi and **S. Francesco** at Bologna (1230) are among the most important examples. More frequently the chapels form a range along the east side of the transepts, especially in the Franciscan churches, which otherwise retain many basilican features. A comparison of the plans of S. Andrea at Vercelli, the Duomo at Florence, the cathedrals of Sienna and Milan, S. Petronio at Bologna and the Certosa at Pavia (Fig. 158), sufficiently illustrates the variety of Italian Gothic plan-types.



FIG. 158.—PLAN OF CERTOSA AT PAVIA.

ORNAMENT. Applied decoration plays a large part in all Italian Gothic designs. Inlaid and mosaic patterns and panelled veneering in colored marble are essential features of the exterior decoration of most Italian churches. Florence offers a fine example of this treatment in the Duomo, and in its accompanying **Campanile** or bell-tower, designed by *Giotto* (1335) and completed by *Gaddi* and *Talenti*. This beautiful tower is an epitome of Italian Gothic decorative art. Its inlays, mosaics, and veneering are treated with consummate elegance, and combined with incrusted reliefs of great beauty. The tracery of this monument and of the side windows of the adjoining cathedral is lighter and more graceful than is common in Italy. Its beauty consists, however, less in movement of line than in richness and elegance of carved and inlaid ornament. In the **Or San Michele**—a combined chapel and granary in Florence dating from 1335—the tracery is far less light and open. In general, except in churches like the cathe-

dral of Milan, built under German influences, the tracery in secular monuments is more successful than in ecclesiastical structures. Venice developed the designing of tracery to greater perfection in her palaces than any other Italian city (see below).

FIG. 159.—UPPER PART OF CAMPANILE, FLORENCE.

MINOR WORKS. Italian Gothic art found freer expression in semi-decorative works, like tombs, altars and votive chapels, than in more monumental structures. The fourteenth century was particularly rich in canopy tombs, mostly in churches, though some were erected in the open air, like the celebrated **Tombs of the Scaligers** in Verona (1329–1380). Many of those in churches in and near Rome, and others in south Italy, are especially rich in inlay of *opus Alexandrinum* upon their twisted columns and panelled sarcophagi. The family of the *Cosmati* acquired great fame for work of this kind during the thirteenth century.

The little marble chapel of **Sta. Maria della Spina,** on the Arno, at Pisa, is an instance of the decorative though illogical use of Gothic forms in minor buildings.

TOWERS. The Italians always preferred the square tower

to the spire, and in most cases treated it as an independent campanile. Following Early Christian and Romanesque traditions, these square towers were usually built with plain sides unbroken by buttresses, and terminated in a flat roof or a low and inconspicuous cone or pyramid. The Campanile at Florence already mentioned is by far the most beautiful of these designs (Fig. 159). The campaniles of Sienna, Lucca, and Pistoia are built in alternate white and black courses, like the adjoining cathedrals. Verona and Mantua have towers with octagonal lanterns In general, these Gothic towers differ from the earlier Romanesque models chiefly in the forms of their openings and their decorative details. They are picturesque and well proportioned, but lack the poetry and variety of the Western Gothic towers and spires.

FIG. 160.—UPPER PART OF PALAZZO VECCHIO, FLORENCE.

SECULAR MONUMENTS. In their public halls, open *loggias*, and domestic architecture the Italians were able to develop the application of Gothic forms with greater freedom than in their church-building, because unfettered by traditional methods of design. The early and vigorous growth of municipal and popular institutions led, as in the Netherlands, to the building of two classes of public halls—the town hall proper or *Podestà*, and the council hall, variously called *Palazzo Communale*, *Pubblico*, or *del Consiglio*. The town halls, as the seat of authority, usually have a severe and fortress-like character;

the **Bargello** at Florence is the most important example, dating in part from 1250. Even more imposing is the well-known **Palazzo Vecchio,** the council hall of the same city (1298, by Arnolfo di Cambio; Fig. 160), with a tower which, rising 308 feet in the air, overhangs the street fully 4 feet, its front wall resting on the face of the powerfully corbelled cornice of the palace. The court and most of the interior were remodelled in

FIG. 161.—LOGGIA DEI LANZI, FLORENCE.

the sixteenth century. At Sienna is a somewhat similar structure in brick, the **Palazzo Pubblico.** At Pistoia the Podestà and the Communal Palace stand opposite each other; in both of these the courtyards still retain their original aspect. At Perugia, Bologna, and Viterbo are others of some importance; while in Lombardy, Bergamo, Como, Cremona, Piacenza and other towns possess smaller halls with open arcades below, of a more elegant and pleasing aspect. More successful still are the open loggias or tribunes erected for the gatherings of public bodies. The noble **Loggia dei Lanzi** at Florence (1376, by *Benci di Cione* and *Simone di Talenti*) is the largest and most

famous of these open vaulted halls, of which several exist in Florence and Sienna. Gothic only in their minor details, they are Romanesque or semi-classic in their broad round arches and strong horizontal lines and cornices (Fig. 161).

PALACES AND HOUSES: VENICE. The northern cities, especially Pisa, Florence, Sienna, Bologna, and Venice, are rich in mediæval public and private palaces and dwellings in brick or marble, in which pointed windows and open arcades are used with excellent effect. In Bologna and Sienna (*e.g.* Grotanelli, Saraceni and Buonsignori palaces) brick is used, in conjunction with details executed in moulded terra-cotta, in a highly artistic and effective way. Viterbo, nearer Rome, also possesses many interesting houses, with street arcades and open stairways or stoops leading to the main entrance.

FIG. 162.—WEST FRONT OF DOGE'S PALACE, VENICE.

The security and prosperity of Venice in the Middle Ages, and the ever present influence of the sun-loving East, made the massive and fortress-like architecture of the inland cities unnecessary. Abundant openings, large windows full of tracery of great lightness and elegance, projecting balconies and the freest use of marble veneering and inlay—a survival of Byzantine traditions of the twelfth century (see p. 133)—give to the Venetian houses and

palaces an air of gayety and elegance found nowhere else. While there are few Gothic churches of importance in Venice, the number of mediæval houses and palaces is very large. Chief among these is the **Doge's Palace** (Fig. 162), adjoining the church of St. Mark. The two-storied arcades of the west and south fronts date from 1354, and originally stood out from the main edifice, which was widened in the next century, when the present somewhat heavy walls, laid up in red, white and black marble in a species of quarry-pattern, were built over the arcades. These arcades are beautiful designs, combining massive strength and grace in a manner quite foreign to Western Gothic ideas. Lighter and more ornate is the **Cà d'Oro,** on the Grand Canal; while the Foscari, Contarini-Fasan, Cavalli, and Pisani palaces, among many others, are admirable examples of the style. In most of these a traceried loggia occupies the central part, flanked by walls incrusted with marble and pierced by Gothic windows with carved mouldings, borders, and balconies. The Venetian Gothic owes its success largely to the absence of structural difficulties to interfere with the purely decorative development of Gothic details.

MONUMENTS. 13th Century: Cistercian abbeys Fossanova, San Galgano, S. Martino al Cimino and Casamari, *cir.* 1208; S. Andrea, Vercelli, 1219; S. Francesco, Assisi, 1228-53; Church at Asti, 1229; S. Francesco, Bologna; Sienna C., 1243-59 (cupola 1259-64; façade 1284); S. M. Gloriosa dei Frari, Venice, 1250-80 (finished 1388); Sta. Chiara, Assisi, 1250; Sta. Trinità, Florence, 1250; S. Antonio, Padua, begun 1256; SS. Giovanni e Paolo, Venice, 1260(?)-1400; Sta. Anastasia, Verona, 1261; Naples C., 1272-1314 (façade 1299; portal 1407; much altered later); S. Lorenzo, Naples, 1275; Campo Santo, Pisa, 1278-83; Arezzo C., 1278; S. M. Novella, Florence, 1278; S. Eustorgio, Milan, 1278; S. M. sopra Minerva, Rome, 1280; Orvieto C., 1290 (façade 1310; roof 1330); Sta. Croce, Florence, 1294 (façade 1863); S. M. del Fiore, or C., Florence, 1294-1310 (enlarged 1357; E. end 1366; dome 1420-64; façade 1887).—14th century: Genoa C., early 14th century; S. Francesco, Sienna, 1310; San Domenico, Sienna, about same date; S. Giovanni

in Fonte, Sienna, 1317; S. M. della Spina, Pisa, 1323; Campanile, Florence, 1335; Or San Michele, Florence, 1337; Milan C., 1386 (cupola 16th century; façade 16th-19th century; new façade building, 1895); S. Petronio, Bologna, 1390; Certosa, Pavia, 1396 (choir, transepts, cupola, cloisters, 15th and 16th centuries); Como C., 1396 (choir and transepts 1513); Lucca C. (S. Martino), Romanesque building remodelled late in 14th century; Verona C.; S. Fermo, Maggiore; S. Francesco, Pisa; S. Lorenzo, Vicenza.—15th century: Perugia C.; S. M. delle Grazie, Milan, 1470 (cupola and exterior E. part later).

Secular Buildings: Pal. Pubblico, Cremona, 1245; Pal. Podestà (Bargello), Florence, 1255 (enlarged 1333-45); Pal. Pubblico, Sienna, 1289-1305 (many later alterations); Pal. Giureconsulti, Cremona, 1292; Broletto, Monza, 1293; Loggia dei Mercanti, Bologna, 1294; Pal. Vecchio, Florence, 1298; Broletto, Como; Pal. Ducale (Doge's Palace), Venice, 1310-40 (great windows 1404; extended 1423-38; courtyard 15th and 16th centuries); Loggia dei Lanzi, Florence, 1335; Loggia del Bigallo, 1337; Broletto, Bergamo, 14th century; Loggia dei Nobili, Sienna, 1407; Pal. Pubblico, Udine, 1457; Loggia dei Mercanti, Ancona; Pal. del Governo, Bologna; Pal. Pepoli, Bologna; Palaces Conte Bardi, Davanzati, Capponi, all at Florence; at Lucca, Pal. Guinigi; at Sienna, Pal. Tolomei, 1205; Pal. Saraceni, Pal. Buonsignori, Pal. Salimbeni, Pal. Grotanelli; at Venice, Pal. Contarini-Fasan, Cavalli, Foscari, Pisani, and many others; others in Padua and Vicenza.

CHAPTER XX.

EARLY RENAISSANCE ARCHITECTURE IN ITALY.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: Anderson, *Architecture of the Renaissance in Italy.* Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance; Der Cicerone.* Cellesi, *Sei Fabbriche di Firenze.* Cicognara, *Le Fabbriche più cospicue di Venezia.* Durm, *Die Baukunst der Renaissance in Italien* (in *Hdbuch. d. Arch.*). Fergusson, *History of Modern Architecture.* Geymüller, *La Renaissance en Toscane.* Kinross, *Details from Italian Buildings.* Meyer, *Oberitalienische Frührenaissance: Bauten und Bildwerke der Lombardei.* Montigny et Famin, *Architecture Toscane.* Moore, *Character of Renaissance Architecture.* Müntz, *La Renaissance en Italie et en France à l'époque de Charles VIII.* Palustre, *L'Architecture de la Renaissance.* Schütz, *Die Renaissance in Italien.* Steginann, *Die Architektur der Renaissance in Toscana.* Symonds, *The Renaissance of the Fine Arts in Italy.* Tosi and Becchio, *Altars, Tabernacles, and Tombs.*

THE CLASSIC REVIVAL. The abandonment of Gothic architecture in Italy and the substitution in its place of forms derived from classic models were occasioned by no sudden or merely local revolution. The Renaissance was the result of a profound intellectual movement, whose roots may be traced far back into the Middle Ages, and which manifested itself first in Italy simply because there the conditions were most propitious. It spread through Europe just as rapidly as similar conditions appearing in other countries prepared the way for it. The essence of this far-reaching movement was the protest of the individual reason against the trammels of external and arbitrary authority—a protest which found its earliest organized expression in the Human-

ists. In its assertion of the intellectual and moral rights of the individual, the Renaissance laid the foundations of modern civilization. The same spirit, in rejecting the authority and teachings of the Church in matters of purely secular knowledge, led to the questionings of the precursors of modern science and the discoveries of the early navigators. But in nothing did the reaction against mediæval scholasticism and asceticism display itself more strikingly than in the joyful enthusiasm which marked the pursuit of classic studies. The long-neglected treasures of classic literature were reopened and turned to new account in the fourteenth century by the immortal trio—Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio. The joy of living, the delight in beauty and pleasure for their own sakes, the exultant awakening to the sense of personal freedom, which came with the bursting of mediæval fetters, found in classic art and literature their most sympathetic expression. It was in Italy, where feudalism had never fully established itself, and where the municipalities and guilds had developed, as nowhere else, the sense of civic and personal freedom, that these symptoms first manifested themselves. In Italy, and above all in the Tuscan cities, they appeared throughout the fourteenth century in the growing enthusiasm for all that recalled the antique culture, and in the rapid advance of luxury and refinement in both public and private life.

THE RENAISSANCE OF THE ARTS. Classic Roman architecture had never lost its influence on the Italian taste. Gothic art, already declining in the West, had never been in Italy more than a borrowed garb, clothing architectural conceptions classic rather than Gothic in spirit. The antique monuments which abounded on every hand were ever present models for the artist, and to the Florentines of the early fifteenth century the civilization which had created them represented the highest ideal of human culture. They longed to revive in their own time the glories of ancient Rome, and appropriated with uncritical and undiscriminating enthusiasm the good and the bad, the early and

the late forms of Roman art. Naively unconscious of the disparity between their own architectural conceptions and those they fancied they imitated, they were, unknown to themselves, creating a new style, in which the details of Roman art were fitted in novel combinations to new requirements. In proportion as the Church lost its hold on the culture of the age, this new architecture entered increasingly into the service of private luxury and public display. It created, it is true, striking types of church design, and made of the dome one of the most imposing of external features; but its most characteristic products were palaces, villas, council halls, and monuments to the great and the powerful. The personal element in design asserted itself as never before in the growth of schools and the development of styles. Thenceforward the history of Italian architecture becomes the history of the achievements of individual artists.

EARLY BEGINNINGS. Already in the thirteenth century the pulpits of Niccolò Pisano at Sienna and Pisa had revealed that master's direct recourse to antique monuments for inspiration and suggestion. In the frescoes of Giotto and his followers, and in the architectural details of many nominally Gothic buildings, classic forms had appeared with increasing frequency during the fourteenth century. This was especially true in Florence, which was then the artistic capital of Italy. Never, perhaps, since the days of Pericles, had there been another community so permeated with the love of beauty in art, and so endowed with the capacity to realize it. Her artists, with unexampled versatility, addressed themselves with equal success to goldsmiths' work, sculpture, architecture and engineering—often to painting and poetry as well; and they were quick to catch in their art the spirit of the classic revival. The new movement achieved its first architectural triumph in the dome of the cathedral of Florence (1420–64); and it was Florentine—or at least Tuscan—artists who planted in other centres the seeds of the new art that were to spring up in the local and provincial schools of Sienna, Milan,

Pavia, Bologna, and Venice, of Brescia, Lucca, Perugia, and Rimini, and many other North Italian cities. The movement asserted itself late in Rome and Naples, as an importation from Northern Italy, but it bore abundant fruit in these cities in its later stages.

PERIODS. The classic styles which grew up out of the Renaissance may be divided for convenience into four periods, although, as in all the history of architecture, the date-limits assigned are wholly arbitrary, since there was nowhere any sharp dividing line between them.

THE EARLY RENAISSANCE or FORMATIVE PERIOD, 1420–90; characterized by the grace and freedom of the decorative detail, suggested by Roman prototypes and applied to compositions of great variety and originality.

THE HIGH RENAISSANCE or FORMALLY CLASSIC PERIOD, 1490–1550. During this period classic details, and especially the "orders," were copied with increasing fidelity. There was increase of stateliness but some loss in freedom and delicacy of design.

THE BAROQUE, 1550–1600; a period of classic formality characterized by the use of colossal orders, engaged columns and rather scanty and heavy decoration.

THE DECLINE, 1600–1700; a period marked by poverty of invention in the composition and a predominance of vulgar sham and display in the decoration. Broken pediments, huge scrolls, florid stucco-work and a general disregard of architectural propriety were universal.

During the eighteenth century there was a reaction from these extravagances, which showed itself in a return to the imitation of classic models, sometimes not without a certain dignity of composition and restraint in the decoration.

By many writers the name Renaissance is confined to the first period. This is etymologically correct; but the difficulty of dissociating the first period historically from those which followed it.

down to the final exhaustion of the artistic movement to which it gave birth, warrants a broader use of the term.

Another division is made by the Italians, who give the name of the *Quattrocento* to the period which closed with the end of the fifteenth century, *Cinquecento* to the sixteenth century, and *Seicento* to the seventeenth century or Decline. It has, however, become common to confine the use of the term Cinquecento to the first half of the sixteenth century.

CONSTRUCTION AND DETAIL. The architects of the Renaissance occupied themselves more with form than with construction, and rarely set themselves constructive problems of great difficulty. Although the new architecture began with the colossal dome of the cathedral of Florence, and culminated in the stupendous church of St. Peter at Rome, it was pre-eminently an architecture of palaces and villas, of façades and of decorative display. Constructive difficulties were reduced to their lowest terms, and the constructive framework was concealed, not emphasized, by the decorative apparel of the design. Among the masterpieces of the early Renaissance are many buildings of small dimensions, such as gates, chapels, tombs and fountains. In these the individual fancy had full sway, and produced surprising results by the beauty of enriched mouldings, of carved friezes with infant genii, wreaths of fruit, griffins, masks and scrolls; by pilasters covered with arabesques as delicate in modelling as if wrought in silver; by inlays of marble, panels of glazed terra-cotta, marvellously carved doors, fine stucco-work in relief, capitals and cornices of wonderful richness and variety. The Roman orders appeared only in free imitations, with panelled and carved pilasters for the most part instead of columns, and capitals of fanciful design, recalling remotely the Corinthian by their volutes and leaves (Fig. 163). Instead of the low-pitched classic pediments, there appears frequently an arched cornice enclosing a sculptured lunette. Doors and windows were enclosed in richly carved frames, sometimes arched and sometimes square. Fa-

çades were flat and unbroken, depending mainly for effect upon the distribution and adornment of the openings, mouldings, and cornices. Internally vaults and flat ceilings of wood and plaster were about equally common, the barrel vault and dome occurring far more frequently than the groined vault. Many of the ceilings of this period are of remarkable richness and beauty.

FIG. 163.—EARLY RENAISSANCE CAPITAL, PAL. ZORZI, VENICE.

THE EARLY RENAISSANCE IN FLORENCE: THE DUOMO. In the year 1417 a public competition was held for completing the cathedral of Florence by a dome over the immense octagon, 139 feet in diameter. *Filippo Brunelleschi*, sculptor and architect (1377–1446), who with Donatello had journeyed to Rome to study there the masterworks of ancient art, after demonstrating the inadequacy of all the solutions proposed by the competitors, was finally permitted to undertake the gigantic task according to his own plans. These provided for an octagonal dome in two shells, connected by eight major and sixteen minor ribs, and crowned by a lantern at the top (Fig. 164). This wholly original conception, by which for the first time (outside of Moslem art) the dome was made an external feature fitly terminating in the light forms and upward movement of a lantern, was carried out between the years 1420 and 1464. Though in no wise an imitation of Roman forms, it was classic in its spirit, in its vastness and in its simplic-

ity of line, and was made possible solely by Brunelleschi's studies of Roman design and construction (Fig. 165).

OTHER CHURCHES. From Brunelleschi's designs were also erected the **Pazzi Chapel** in the cloister of Sta. Croce, a rectangular interior with a dome over the central part, and preceded by a vestibule with a richly decorated vault; and the two great churches of **S. Lorenzo** (1425) and **S. Spirito** (1433–1476, Fig. 166). Both of these were in reality basilicas with transepts and domical-vaulted side aisles. The central aisles were covered with flat ceilings and a low dome was built over the crossing. All the details were imitated from Roman models, and yet the result was something entirely new, and the pendentives and domes employed by Brunelleschi were Byzantine rather than Roman. It is not known whence he derived them. The **Old Sacristy** of S. Lorenzo was another domical design of great beauty.

FIG. 164.—SECTION OF DOME OF DUOMO, FLORENCE.

From this time on the new style was in general use for church designs. *L. B. Alberti* (1404–73), who had in Rome mastered classic details more thoroughly than Brunelleschi, remodelled the church of **S. Francesco** at **Rimini** with Roman pilasters and arches, and with engaged orders in the façade, which, however, was never completed. His great work was the church of **S. Andrea** at **Mantua,** a Latin cross in plan, with a dome at the intersection (the present high dome dating, however, only from the eighteenth century) and a façade to which the conception of a Roman triumphal arch was skilfully adapted. His façade of incrusted marbles for the church of S. M. Novella at Florence was

a less successful work, though its flaring consoles over the side aisles established an unfortunate precedent frequently imitated in later churches.

A great activity in church-building marked the period between 1475 and 1490. The plans of the churches erected about this time throughout north Italy display an interesting variety of arrangements, in nearly all of which the dome is combined with the three-aisled cruciform plan, either as a central feature at the crossing or as a domical vault over each bay. Bologna and Ferrara possess a number of churches of this kind. Occasionally the basilican arrangement was followed, with columnar arcades separating the aisles. More often, however, the pier-arches were of the Roman type, with engaged columns or pilasters between them. The interiors, presumably intended to receive painted decorations, were in most cases somewhat bare of ornament, pleasing rather by happy proportions and effective vaulting or rich flat ceilings, panelled, painted and gilded, than by elaborate architectural detail. A similar scantiness of ornament is to be remarked in the exteriors, excepting the façades, which were sometimes highly ornate; the doorways, with columns, pediments, sculpture and carving, receiving especial attention. High external domes did not come



FIG. 165.—EXTERIOR OF DOME OF DUOMO, FLORENCE.

into general use until the next period. In Milan, Pavia, and some other Lombard cities, the internal cupola over the crossing was, however, covered externally by a lofty structure in diminishing stages, like that of the Certosa at Pavia (Fig. 157), or that erected by Bramante for the church of S. M. delle Grazie at Milan. The church plans of this period show the greatest variety, though nearly all were adorned with a central dome. Among the most successful were some of the smaller churches, of the Greek cross type, with four short barrel-vaulted arms projecting from a central area covered by a dome of moderate height on pendentives. At Prato, the church of the **Madonna delle Carceri** (1495–1516), by *Giuliano da S. Gallo*, with its unfinished exterior of white marble, its simple and dignified lines, and internal embellishments in della-Robbia ware, is one of the masterpieces of this type, which was an essentially new architectural conception, although never developed to its full monumental possibilities.

FIG. 166.—INTERIOR OF S. SPIRITO, FLORENCE.

In the designing of chapels and oratories the architects of the early Renaissance attained conspicuous success, these edifices presenting fewer structural limitations and being more purely decorative in character than the larger churches. Such façades as that of **S. Ber-**

nardino at Perugia and of the **Frati di S. Spirito** at Bologna are among the most delightful products of the decorative fancy of the fifteenth century.

FLORENTINE PALACES. The architects of this period attained conspicuous success in palace-architecture. The **Riccardi** palace in Florence (1430) marks the first step of the Renaissance in this direction. It was built for the great Cosimo di Medici by *Michelozzi* (1397–1473), a contemporary of Brunelleschi and Alberti, and a man of great talent. Its imposing rectangular façade, with widely spaced mullioned windows in two stories over a massive basement, is crowned with a classic cornice of unusual and almost excessive size. In spite of the bold and fortress-like character of the rusticated masonry of this and similar façades, and their mediæval appearance to modern eyes, they marked a revolution in style and established a type frequently imitated in later years. The courtyard, in contrast with this stern exterior, appears light and cheerful (Fig. 167). Its wall is carried on round arches borne by columns with Corinthianesque capitals, and the arcade is enriched with sculptured medallions. The **Pitti Palace,** by Brunelleschi (1435),* em-

FIG. 167.—COURTYARD OF RICCARDI PALACE, FLORENCE.

* Only the central portion of the palace belongs to Brunelleschi's time. It was successively enlarged in the 16th and 17th centuries.

bodies the same ideas on a more colossal scale, but lacks the grace of an adequate cornice. A lighter and more ornate style appeared in 1460 in the **P. Rucellai,** by Alberti, in which for the first time classical pilasters in superposed stages were applied to a street façade. To avoid the dilemma of either insufficiently crowning the edifice or making the cornice too heavy for the upper range of pilasters, Alberti made use of brackets, occupying the width of the upper frieze, and converting the whole upper entablature into a cornice. But this compromise was not quite successful, and it remained for later architects in Venice, Verona, and Rome to work out more satisfactory methods of applying the orders to many-storied palace façades. In the great **P. Strozzi** (Fig. 168), erected in 1490 by *Benedetto da Majano* and *Cronaca,* the architects reverted to the earlier type of the P. Riccardi, treating it with greater refinement and producing one of the noblest palaces of Italy.

FIG. 168.—FAÇADE OF STROZZI PALACE, FLORENCE.

COURTYARDS; ARCADES. These palaces were all built around interior courts, whose walls rested on columnar arcades, as in the P. Riccardi (Fig. 167). The origin of these arcades may be found in the arcaded cloisters of mediæval monastic churches, which often suggest classic models, as in those of St. Paul-beyond-the-Walls and St. John Lateran at Rome. Brunelleschi not only introduced columnar arcades into a number of cloisters and palace courts, but also used them effectively as exterior features in the **Loggia S. Paolo** and the Foundling Hospital (**Ospedale degli**

Innocenti) at Florence. The chief drawback in these light arcades was their inability to withstand the thrust of the vaulting over the space behind them, and the consequent recourse to iron tie-rods where vaulting was used. The Italians, however, seemed to care little about this disfigurement.

MINOR WORKS. The details of the new style were developed quite as rapidly in purely decorative works as in monumental buildings. Altars, mural monuments, tabernacles, pulpits and *ciboria* afforded scope for the genius of the most distinguished artists. Among those who were specially celebrated in works of this kind should be named *Lucca della Robbia* (1400–82) and his successors, *Mino da Fiesole* (1431–84) and *Benedetto da Majano* (1442–97). Possessed of a wonderful fertility of invention, they and their pupils multiplied their works in extraordinary number and variety, not only throughout North Italy, but also in Rome and Naples. Among the most famous examples of this branch of design may be mentioned a pulpit in Sta. Croce by B. da Majano; a terra-cotta fountain in the sacristy of S. M. Novella, by the della Robbias; the Marsupini tomb in Sta. Croce, by *Desiderio da Settignano* (all in Florence); the della Rovere tomb in S. M. del Popolo, Rome, by Mino da Fiesole, and in the Cathedral at Lucca the Noceto tomb and the Tempietto, by *Matteo Civitali*. It was in works of this character that the Renaissance oftenest made its first appearance in a new centre, as was the case in Sienna, Pisa, Lucca, Naples, etc.

NORTH ITALY. Between 1450 and 1490 the Renaissance presented in Sienna, in a number of important palaces, a sharp contrast to the prevalent Gothic style of that city. The **P. del Governo** (formerly Piccolomini), in the style of the Riccardi at Florence, was built 1469, and the **Spannocchi Palace** in 1470. In 1463 *Ant. Federighi* built there the **Loggia del Papa.** About the same time *Bernardo di Lorenzo* was building for Pope Pius II. (Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini) an entirely new city, **Pienza,** with a cathedral, archbishop's palace, town hall and Papal residence

(the **P. Piccolomini,** an obvious copy of the P. Rucellai in Florence), which are interesting if not strikingly original works. Pisa possesses few early Renaissance structures, owing to the utter prostration of her fortunes in the fifteenth century, and the dominance of Pisan Gothic traditions. In Lucca, besides a wealth of minor monuments (largely the work of Matteo Civitali, 1435–1501) in various churches, a number of palaces date from this period, the most important being the **P. Pretorio** and P. Bernardini. To Milan the Renaissance was carried by the Florentine masters *Michelozzi* and *Filarete*, to whom are respectively due the **Portinari Chapel** in S. Eustorgio (1462) and the earlier part of the great **Ospedale Maggiore** (1457). In the latter, an edifice of brick with terra-cotta enrichments, the windows were Gothic in outline—an unusual mixture of styles, even in Italy. The munificence of the Sforzas, the hereditary tyrants of the province, embellished

FIG. 169.—TOMB OF PIETRO DI NOCETO, LUCCA.

the semi-Gothic **Certosa** of Pavia (see p. 267) with a new marble façade, begun 1476 or 1491, which in its fanciful and exuberant decoration, and the small scale of its parts, belongs properly to the early Renaissance. Exquisitely beautiful in detail, it resembles rather a magnified altar-piece than a work of architecture, properly speaking. Bologna and Ferrara developed somewhat late in the century a strong local school of architecture, remarkable especially for the beauty of its courtyards, its graceful street arcades, and its artistic treatment of brick and terra-cotta (**P. Bevilacqua, P. Fava,** at Bologna; **P. Scrofa, P. Roverella,** at Ferrara). About the same time palaces with interior arcades and details in the new style were erected in Verona, Vicenza, Mantua, and other cities.

VENICE. In this city of merchant princes and a wealthy *bourgeoisie*, the architecture of the Renaissance took on a new aspect of splendor and display. It was late in appearing, the Gothic style with its tinge of Byzantine decorative traditions having here developed into a style well suited to the needs of a rich and relatively tranquil community. These traditions the architects of the new style appropriated in a measure, as in the marble incrustations of the exquisite little church of **S. M. dei Miracoli** (1480–89), and the façade of the **Scuola di S. Marco** (1485–1533), both by *Pietro Lombardo*. Nowhere else, unless on the contemporary façade of the Certosa at Pavia, were marble inlays and delicate carving, combined with a framework of thin pilasters, finely profiled entablatures and arched pediments, so lavishly bestowed upon the street fronts of churches and palaces. The family of the *Lombardi* (Martino, his sons Moro and Pietro, and grandsons Antonio and Tullio), with *Ant. Rizzo* (also called *Riccio* and *Bregno*) and *Bart. Buon*, were the leaders in the architectural Renaissance of this period, and to them Venice owes her choicest masterpieces in the new style. Its first appearance is noted in the later portions of the church of **S. Zaccaria** (1456–1515), partly Gothic internally, with a

façade whose semicircular pediment and small decorative arcades show a somewhat timid but interesting application of classic details. In this church, and still more so in S. Giobbe (1451–93) and the Miracoli above mentioned, the decorative element predominates throughout. It is hard to imagine details more graceful in design, more effective in the swing of their movement

FIG. 170.—VENDRAMINI PALACE, VENICE.

or more delicate in execution than the mouldings, reliefs, wreaths, scrolls, and capitals one encounters in these buildings. Yet in structural interest, in scale and breadth of planning, these early Renaissance Venetian buildings hold a relatively inferior rank.

PALACES. The great **Court** of the **Doge's Palace,** begun 1483 by *Ant. Rizzo*, belongs only in part to the first period. It shows, however, the lack of constructive principle and of largeness of composition just mentioned, but its decorative effect and picturesque variety elicit almost universal admiration. Like the neighboring façade of St. Mark's, it violates nearly every principle

of correct composition, and yet in a measure atones for this capital defect by its charm of detail. Far more satisfactory from the purely architectural point of view is the façade of the **P. Vendramini** (Vendramin-Calergi), by Pietro Lombardo (1481). The simple, stately lines of its composition, the dignity of its broad arched and mullioned windows, separated by engaged columns—the earliest example in Venice of this feature, and one of the earliest in Italy—its well-proportioned basement and upper stories, crowned by an adequate but somewhat heavy entablature, make this one of the finest palaces in Italy (Fig. 170). It established a type of large-windowed, vigorously modelled façades which later architects developed, but hardly surpassed. In the smaller contemporary P. Dario, another type appears, better suited for small buildings, depending for effect mainly upon well-ordered openings and incrusted panelling of colored marble.

ROME. Internal disorders and the long exile of the popes had by the end of the fourteenth century reduced Rome to utter insignificance. Not until the second half of the fifteenth century did returning prosperity and wealth afford the Renaissance its opportunity in the Eternal City. Pope Nicholas V. had, indeed, begun the rebuilding of St. Peter's from designs by B. Rossellini, in 1450, but the project lapsed shortly after with the death of the pope. The earliest Renaissance building in Rome was the **P. di Venezia,** begun in 1455, together with the adjoining porch of S. Marco. In this palace and the adjoining unfinished Palazzetto we find the influence of the old Roman monuments clearly manifested in the court arcades, built like those of the Colosseum, with superposed stages of massive piers and engaged columns carrying entablatures. The proportions are awkward, the details coarse; but the spirit of Roman classicism is here seen in the germ. The exterior of this palace is, however, still mediæval in spirit. The architects are unknown; *Giuliano da Majano* (1432–90), *Giacomo di Pietrasanta*, and *Meo del Caprino* (1430–1501) are known to have worked upon it, but it is not certain in what capacity.

The new style, reaching, and in time overcoming, the conservatism of the Church, overthrew the old basilican traditions. In **S. Agostino** (1479–83), by *Pietrasanta*, and **S. M. del Popolo**, by *Pintelli* (?), piers with pilasters or half-columns and massive arches separate the aisles, and the crossing is crowned with a dome. To the same period belong the Sistine chapel and parts of the Vatican palace, but the interest of these lies rather in their later decorations than in their somewhat scanty architectural merit. The architectural renewal of Rome, thus begun, reached its culmination in the following period.

OTHER MONUMENTS. The complete enumeration of even the most important Early Renaissance monuments of Italy is impossible within our limits. Two or three only can here be singled out as suggesting types. Among town halls of this period the first place belongs to the **P. del Consiglio** at Verona, by *Fra Giocondo* (1435–1515). In this beautiful edifice the façade consists of a light and graceful arcade supporting a wall pierced with four windows, and covered with elaborate frescoed arabesques (recently restored). Its unfortunate division by pilasters into four bays, with a pier in the centre, is a blemish avoided in the contemporary **P. del Consiglio** at Padua. The **Ducal Palace** at Urbino, by *Luciano da Laurano* (1468), is noteworthy for its fine arcaded court, and was highly famed in its day. At Brescia **S. M. dei Miracoli** is a remarkable example of a cruciform domical church dating from the close of this period, and is especially celebrated for the exuberant decoration of its porch and its elaborate detail. Few campaniles were built in this period; the best of them are at Venice. Naples possesses several interesting Early Renaissance monuments, chief among which are the **Porta Capuana** (1484), by *Giul. da Majano*, the triumphal **Arch of Alphonso** of Arragon, by *Pietro di Martino*, and the **Cuomo** and **Gravina** palaces, the latter by *Gab. d'Agnolo*. Naples is also rich in minor works of the Early Renaissance, in which it ranks with Florence, Venice, and Rome.

CHAPTER XXI.

RENAISSANCE ARCHITECTURE IN ITALY—*Continued.*

THE ADVANCED RENAISSANCE AND DECLINE.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: As before, Burckhardt, Cicognara, Fergusson, Palustre. Also, Gauthier, *Les plus beaux édifices de Gênes.* Geymüller, *Les projets primitifs pour la basilique de St. Pierre de Rome.* Gurlitt, *Geschichte des Barockstiles in Italien.* Laspeyres, *Die Kirchen der Renaissance in Mittel Italien.* Letarouilly, *Édifices de Rome moderne; Le Vatican.* Palladio, *The Works of A. Palladio.* Strack, *Die Central- und Kuppelkirchen der Renaissance in Italien.* Also, for St. Peter's and domed churches, consult Gosset, *Les coupoles d'orient et d'occident*, and Isabelle, *Les édifices circulaires et les domes.*

CHARACTER OF THE ADVANCED RENAISSANCE. It was inevitable that the study and imitation of Roman architecture should lead to an increasingly literal rendering of classic details and a closer copying of antique compositions. Toward the close of the fifteenth century the symptoms began to multiply of the approaching reign of formal classicism. Correctness in the reproduction of old Roman forms came to be highly esteemed, and in the following period the orders became the principal resource of the architect. During the so-called Cinquecento, that is, from the close of the fifteenth century to nearly or quite 1550, architecture still retained much of the freedom and refinement of the Quattrocento. There was meanwhile a notable advance in dignity and amplitude of design, especially in the internal distribution of buildings. Externally the orders were freely used as subordinate features in the decoration of doors and windows, and in

court arcades of the Roman type. The lantern-crowned dome upon a high drum was developed into one of the noblest of architectural forms. Great attention was bestowed upon all subordinate features; doors and windows were treated with frames and pediments of extreme elegance and refinement; all the cornices and mouldings were proportioned and profiled with the utmost care, and the balustrade was elaborated into a feature at once useful and highly ornate. Interior decoration was even more splendid than before, if somewhat less delicate and subtle; relief enrichments in stucco were used with admirable effect, and the greatest artists exercised their talents in the painting of vaults and ceilings, as in P. del Té at Mantua, by *Giulio Romano* (1492–1546), and the Sistine Chapel at Rome, by Michael Angelo. This period is distinguished by an exceptional number of great architects and buildings. It was ushered in by *Bramante Lazzari*, of Urbino (1444–1514), and closed during the career of *Michael Angelo Buonarotti* (1475–1564); two names worthy to rank with that of Brunelleschi. Inferior only to these in architectural genius were *Raphael* (1483–1520), *Baldassare Peruzzi* (1481–1536), *Antonio da San Gallo the Younger* (1485–1546), and *G. Barozzi da Vignola* (1507–1572), in Rome; *Giacopo Tatti Sansovino* (1479–1570), in Venice, and others almost equally illustrious. This period witnessed the erection of an extraordinary series of palaces, villas, and churches, the beginning and much of the construction of St. Peter's at Rome, and a complete transformation in the aspect of that city.

BRAMANTE'S WORKS. While precise time limits cannot be set to architectural styles, it is not irrational to date this period from the maturing of Bramante's genius. While his earlier works in Milan belong to the Quattrocento (S. M. delle Grazie, the sacristy of San Satiro, the extension of the Great Hospital), his later designs show the classic tendency very clearly. The charming **Tempietto** in the court of S. Pietro in Montorio at Rome, a circular temple-like chapel (1502), is composed of purely

classic elements, although it cannot be said to be a copy of any known Roman edifice. In the **P.Giraud** (Fig. 171) and the great **Cancelleria** Palace, pilasters appear in the external composition, and all the details of doors and windows betray the results of classic study, as well as the refined taste of their designer.* The beautiful courtyard of the Cancelleria combines the Florentine system of arches on columns with the Roman system of superposed arcades independent of the court wall. In 1506 Bramante began the rebuilding of St. Peter's for Julius II. (see p. 298) and

*It is now denied by many investigators that either the Cancelleria or the Giraud palace is the work of Bramante, or any one of two or three smaller houses in Rome showing a somewhat similar architectural treatment. The date 1495 carved on a frieze of the Cancelleria palace is thought to forbid its attribution to Bramante, who is not known to have come to Rome till 1500; and there is a lack of positive evidence of his authorship of the Giraud palace and of the other houses which seem to be by the same hand. The resemblance in style between this group of buildings and his acknowledged work is considered by some insufficient to identify them as Bramante's.

It must be remarked, on the other hand, that this notable group of works, stamped with the marks and even the mannerisms of a strong personality, reveal an ability amounting to genius, and by no means unworthy of Bramante. It is almost inconceivable that they should have been designed by a mere beginner previously unknown and forgotten soon after. Those who deny the attribution to Bramante have thus far been unable to find another name worthy of the credit of these works, no two of them having agreed on any one person. None of the names suggested seems to fit the conditions even as well as Bramante's; while to some critics the comparison of these works with Bramante's Milanese work on the one hand and his great Court of the Belvedere in the Vatican on the other, yields conclusions quite opposed to those of the advocates of another authorship than Bramante's.

The controversy must be considered as still open, and it will probably so remain until settled by the discovery of new and undisputable evidence.

the construction of a new and imposing papal palace adjoining it on the Vatican hill. Of this colossal group of edifices, commonly known as the **Vatican,** he executed the greater Belvedere court (afterward divided in two by the Library and the Braccio Nuovo), the lesser octagonal court of the Belvedere, and the court of San Damaso, with its arcades afterward frescoed by Raphael and his school. Besides these, the cloister of S. M. della Pace, and many other works in and out of Rome, reveal the impress of Bramante's genius, alike in their admirable plans and in the harmony and beauty of their details.



FIG. 171.—FAÇADE OF THE GIRAUD PALACE, ROME.

FLORENTINE PALACES. The P. Riccardi long remained the accepted type of palace in Florence. As we have seen, it was imitated in the Strozzi palace, as late as 1489, with greater perfection of detail, but with no radical change of conception. In the **P. Gondi,** however, begun in the following year by *Giuliano da San Gallo* (1445–1516), a more pronounced classic spirit appears, especially in the court and the interior design. Early in the sixteenth century classic columns and pediments began to be used as decorations for doors and windows; the rustication was confined to basements and corner-quoins, and niches, loggias, and porches gave variety of light and shade to the façades (**P. Bartolini,** by *Baccio d'Agnolo;* **P. Larderel,** 1515, by *Dosio;* **P. Guadagni,** by *Cronaca;* **P. Pandolfini,** 1518, attributed to Raphael). In the **P. Serristori,** by Baccio d'Agnolo (1510), pilasters were ap-

plied to the composition of the façade, but this example was not often followed in Florence.

ROMAN PALACES. These followed a different type. They were usually of great size, and built around ample courts with arcades of classic model in two or three stories. The broad street façade in three stories with an attic or mezzanine was crowned with a rich cornice. The orders were sparingly used externally and effect was sought principally in the careful proportioning of the stories, in the form and distribution of the square-headed and arched openings, and in the design of mouldings, string-courses, cornices, and other details. The *piano nobile*, or first story above the basement, was given up to suites of sumptuous reception-rooms and halls, with magnificent ceilings and frescoes by the great painters of the day, while antique statues and reliefs adorned the courts, vestibules, and niches of these princely dwellings.



FIG. 172. PLAN OF FARNESE PALACE.

The **Massimi** palace, by Peruzzi, is an interesting example of this type. The Vatican, Cancelleria, and Giraud palaces have already been mentioned; other notable palaces are the Palma (1506) and Sacchetti (1540), by A. da San Gallo the Younger; the **Farnesina,** by Peruzzi, with celebrated fresco decorations designed by Raphael; and the Lante (1520) and Altemps (1530), by Peruzzi. But the noblest creation of this period was the

FARNESE PALACE, by many esteemed the finest in Italy. It was begun in 1530 for Alex. Farnese (Paul III.) by A. da San Gallo the Younger, with Vignola's collaboration. The simple

but admirable plan is shown in Fig. 172, and the courtyard, the most imposing in Italy, in Fig. 173. The exterior is monotonous, but the noble cornice by Michael Angelo measurably redeems this defect. The fine vaulted columnar entrance vestibule, the court and the *salons*, make up an *ensemble* worthy of the great architects who designed it. The loggia toward the river was added by *Giacomo della Porta* in 1580.

FIG. 173.—ANGLE OF COURT OF FARNESE PALACE, ROME.

VILLAS. The Italian villa of this pleasure-loving period afforded full scope for the most playful fancies of the architect, decorator, and landscape gardener. It comprised usually a dwelling, a *casino* or amusement-house, and many minor edifices, summer-houses, arcades, etc., disposed in extensive grounds laid out with terraces, cascades, and shaded alleys. The style was graceful, sometimes trivial, but almost always pleasing, making free use of stucco enrichments, both internally and externally, with abundance of gilding and frescoing. The **Villa Madama** (1516), by Raphael, with stucco-decorations by Giulio Romano, though incomplete and now dilapidated, is a noted example of the style. More complete, the **Villa of Pope Julius,** by Vignola (1550), belongs by its purity of style to this period; its façade well exemplifies the simplicity, dignity, and fine proportions of this master's work. In addition to these Roman villas may be mentioned the **V. Medici** (1540, by *Annibale Lippi;* now the French Academy of Rome); the **Casino del Papa** (or Villa Pia) in the Vatican Gardens, by *Pirro Ligorio* (1560); the **V. Lante,** near

Viterbo, and the **V. d'Este,** at Tivoli, as displaying among almost countless others the Italian skill in combining architecture and gardening.

CHURCHES AND CHAPELS. This period witnessed the building of a few churches of the first rank, but it was especially prolific in memorial, votive, and sepulchral chapels added to churches already existing, like the **Chigi Chapel** of S. M. del Popolo, by Raphael. The earlier churches of this period generally followed antecedent types, with the dome as the central feature dominating a cruciform plan, and simple, unostentatious and sometimes uninteresting exteriors. Among them may be mentioned: at Pistoia, S. M. del Letto and **S. M. dell' Umiltà,** the latter a fine domical rotunda by *Ventura Vitoni* (1509), with an imposing vestibule; at Venice, **S. Salvatore,** by *Tullio Lombardo* (1530), an admirable edifice with alternating domical and barrel-vaulted bays; **S. Giorgio dei Grechi** (1536), by *Sansovino*, and S. M. Formosa; at Todi, the **Madonna della Consolazione** (1508–1606), by *Cola da Caprarola*, a charming design with a high dome and four apses; * at Montefiascone, the **Madonna delle Grazie,** by *Sammichele* (1523), besides several churches at Bologna, Ferrara, Prato, Sienna, and Rome of almost or quite equal interest. In these churches one may trace the development of the dome as an external feature, while in **S. Biagio,** at Montepulciano, the effort was made by *Ant. da San Gallo the Elder* (1455–1534) to combine with it the contrasting lines of two campaniles, of which, however, but one was completed.

ST. PETER'S. The culmination of Renaissance church architecture was reached in **St. Peter's,** at Rome. The original project of Nicholas V. having lapsed with his death, it was the intention of Julius II. to erect on the same site a stupendous domical church over the monument he had ordered of Michael Angelo. The design of Bramante, who began its erection in 1506, com-

* Often attributed to Bramante, who may possibly have had a hand in its design.

prised a Greek cross with apsidal arms, the four angles occupied by domical chapels and loggias within a square outline (Fig. 174). The too hasty execution of this noble design led to the collapse of two of the arches under the dome, and to long delays after Bramante's death in 1514. Raphael, Giuliano da San Gallo, Peruzzi, and A. da San Gallo the Younger successively supervised the works under the popes from Leo X. to Paul III., and devised a vast number of plans for its completion. Most of these involved fundamental alterations of the original scheme, and were motived by the abandonment of the proposed monument of Julius II.; a church, and not a mausoleum, being required. In 1546 Michael Angelo was assigned by Paul III. to the works, and gave final form to the general design in a simplified version of Bramante's plan with more massive supports, a square east front* with a portico for the chief entrance, and the unrivalled **Dome** which is its most striking feature. This dome, slightly altered and improved in curvature by della Porta after M. Angelo's death in 1564, was completed by *D. Fontana* in 1604. It is the most majestic creation of the Renaissance, and one of the greatest architectural conceptions of all history. It measures 140 feet in internal diameter, and with its two shells rises from a lofty drum, buttressed by coupled



FIG. 174.—ORIGINAL PLAN OF ST. PETER'S, ROME.

* St. Peter's fronts to the East instead of the West, reversing the usual orientation of churches, but conforming to the practice of the earlier basilicas.

Corinthian columns, to a height of 405 feet to the top of the lantern. The church, as left by Michael Angelo, was harmonious in its proportions, though the single order used internally and externally dwarfed by its colossal scale the vast dimensions of the edifice. Unfortunately in 1606 *C. Maderna* was employed by Paul V. to lengthen the nave by two bays, destroying the proportions of the whole, and hiding the dome from view on a near approach. The present tasteless façade was Maderna's work. The splendid atrium or portico added (1629–67), by *Bernini*, as an approach, mitigates but does not cure the ugliness and pettiness of this front.



FIG. 175.—PLAN OF ST. PETER'S, ROME, AS NOW STANDING.

The portion below the line *A*, *B*, and the side chapels, *C*, *D*, were added by Maderna. The remainder represents Michael Angelo's plan.

St. Peter's as thus completed (Figs. 175, 176) is the largest church in existence, and in many respects is architecturally worthy of its pre-eminence. The central aisle, nearly 600 feet long, with its stupendous panelled and gilded vault, 83 feet in span, the vast central area and the majestic dome, belong to a conception unsurpassed in majestic simplicity and effectiveness. The construction is almost excessively massive, but admirably disposed. On the other hand the nave is too long, and the details not only lack originality and interest, but are also too large in scale, dwarfing the whole edifice. The interior (Fig. 176) is wanting in the so



FIG. 176.—INTERIOR OF ST. PETER'S, ROME.

briety of color that befits so stately a design; its decorative details, especially the stucco enrichments added in the seventeenth century, are to a large extent coarse and tasteless, tending to nullify the solemnity which the grand dimensions impart to the interior effect. But in spite of its defects it is a most impressive edifice and a wonderful monument of architecture.

THE PERIOD OF FORMAL CLASSICISM. By the middle of the sixteenth century the classic orders had come to dominate all architectural design. While Vignola, who wrote a treatise upon the orders, had employed them with unfailing refinement and judgment, his contemporaries and successors showed less discernment and taste, making of them an end rather than a means. Too often mere classical correctness was substituted for the fundamental qualities of original invention and intrinsic beauty of composition. The innovation of colossal orders extending through several stories, while it gave to exterior designs a certain grandeur of scale, tended to coarseness and even vulgarity of detail. Sculpture and ornament began to lose their refinement, and while street-architecture gained in monumental scale, and public squares received a more stately adornment than ever before, the street-façades individually were too often bare and uninteresting in their correct formality. In the interiors of churches and large halls there appears a struggle between a cold and dignified simplicity and a growing tendency toward pretentious sham. But these pernicious tendencies did not fully mature till the latter part of the century, and the half-century after 1540 or 1550 was prolific of notable works in both ecclesiastical and secular architecture. The names of Michael Angelo and Vignola, whose careers began in the preceding period; of Palladio and della Porta (1541–1604) in Rome; of Ammanati in Florence and Lucca, of Sammichele and Sansovino in Verona and Venice, and of Galeazzo Alessi in Genoa, stand high in the ranks of architectural merit.

CHURCHES. The type established by St. Peter's was widely

imitated throughout Italy. The churches in which a Greek or Latin cross is dominated by a high dome rising from a drum and terminating in a lantern, and is treated both internally and externally with Roman Corinthian pilasters and arches, are almost numberless. Among the best churches of this type is the **Gesù** at Rome, by Vignola (1568), with a highly ornate interior of excellent proportions and a less interesting exterior, the façade adorned with two stories of orders and great flanking volutes over the sides (see p. 277). Two churches at Venice, by *Palladio*—**S. Giorgio Maggiore** (1560; façade by *Scamozzi*, 1575) and the **Redentore**—offer a strong contrast to the Gesù, in their cold and almost bare but pure and correct designs. An imitation of Bramante's plan for St. Peter's appears in **S. M. di Carignano,** at Genoa, by *Galeazzo Alessi* (1500-72), begun 1552, a fine structure, though inferior in scale and detail to its original. Besides these and other important churches there were many large domical chapels of great splendor added to earlier churches; of these the **Chapel of Sixtus V.** in S. M. Maggiore, at Rome, by *D. Fontana* (1543–1607), is an excellent example.

PALACES: ROME. The palaces on the Capitoline Hill, built at different dates (1540–1644) from designs by Michael Angelo, illustrate the palace architecture of this period, and the imposing effect of a single colossal order running through two stories. This treatment, though well adapted to produce monumental effects in large squares, was dangerous in its bareness and heaviness of scale, and was better suited for buildings of vast dimensions than for ordinary street-façades. In other Roman palaces of this time the traditions of the preceding period still prevailed, as in the **Sapienza** (University), by della Porta (1575), which has a dignified court and a façade of great refinement without columns or pilasters. The **Papal palaces** built by Domenico Fontana on the Lateran, Quirinal, and Vatican hills, between 1574 and 1590, externally copying the style of the Farnese, show a similar return to earlier models, but are less pure and refined in detail than the

Sapienza. The great pentagonal **Palace of Caprarola,** near Rome, by Vignola, is perhaps the most successful and imposing production of the Roman classic school in this field.

VERONA. Outside of Rome, palace-building took on various local and provincial phases of style, of which the most important were the closely related styles of Verona, Venice, and Vicenza. *Michele Sammichele* (1484–1559), who built in Verona the **Bevilacqua, Canossa, Pompei,** and **Verzi** palaces and the four chief city gates, and in Venice the **P. Grimani,** his masterpiece (1550), was a designer of great originality and power. He introduced into his military architecture, as in the gates of Verona, the use of rusticated orders, which he treated with skill and taste. The idea was copied by later architects and applied, with doubtful propriety, to palace-façades; though Ammanati's garden-façade for the Pitti palace, in Florence (*cir.* 1560), is an impressive and successful design.

VENICE. Into the development of the maturing classic style *Giacopo Tatti Sansovino* (1477–1570) introduced in his Venetian buildings new elements of splendor. Coupled columns between arches themselves supported on columns, and a profusion of figure sculpture, gave to his palace-façades a hitherto unknown magnificence of effect, as in the **Library of St. Mark** (now the Royal Palace, Fig. 177), and the **Cornaro** palace (P. Corner de Cà Grande), both dating from about 1530–40. So strongly did he impress upon Venice these ornate and sumptuous variations on classic themes, that later architects adhered, in a very debased period, to the main features and spirit of his work.

VICENZA. Of *Palladio's* churches in Venice we have already spoken; his palaces are mainly to be found in his native city, Vicenza. In these structures he displayed great fertility of invention and a profound familiarity with the classic orders, but the degenerate taste of the Baroque period already begins to show itself in his work. There is less of architectural propriety and grace in these pretentious palaces, with their colossal orders and

their affectation of grandeur, than in the designs of Vignola or Sammichele. Wood and plaster, used to mimic stone, indicate the approaching reign of sham in all design (**P. Barbarano,** 1570; **Chieregati,** 1560; **Tiene, Valmarano,** 1556; **Porto, Prefetizzio, Villa Capra**). His masterpiece is the two-storied arcade about the mediæval **Basilica,** in which the arches are supported on a minor order between engaged columns serving as buttresses. This treatment has in consequence ever since been known as the *Palladian Motive.*

FIG. 177.—LIBRARY OF ST. MARK, VENICE.

GENOA. During the second half of the sixteenth century a remarkable series of palaces was erected in Genoa, especially notable for their great courts and imposing staircases. These last were given unusual prominence owing to differences of level in the courts, arising from the slope of their sites on the hillside. Among these palaces the **P. Giustiniani, Lercari, Cambiasi, Sauli, Pallavicini** and several others, and the elegant **Loggia dei Banchi,** were by *Galeazzo Alessi* (1502–72); others by architects of lesser note; but nearly all characterized by their effective planning, fine stairs and loggias, and strong and dignified, if sometimes uninteresting, detail (**P. Balbi,**

Brignole, Doria-Tursi [or Municipio], by *Rocco Lurago*, **Durazzo** [or Reale], and **University** by *Bianchi*).

THE BAROQUE STYLE. A reaction from the cold *classicismo* of the late sixteenth century showed itself in the following period, in the lawless and vulgar extravagances of the so-called *Baroque* style. The wealthy Jesuit order was a notorious contributor to the debasement of architectural taste. Most of the Jesuit churches and many others not belonging to the order, but following its pernicious example, are monuments of bad taste and pretentious sham. Broken and contorted pediments, huge scrolls, heavy mouldings, ill-applied sculpture in exaggerated attitudes, and a general disregard for architectural propriety characterized this period, especially in its church architecture, to whose style the name *Jesuit* is often applied. Sham marble and heavy and excessive gilding were universal (Fig. 178). *C. Maderna* (1556–1629), *Lorenzo Bernini* (1589–1680), and *F. Borromini* (1599–1667) were the worst offenders of the period, though Bernini was an artist of undoubted ability, as proved by his colonnades or atrium in front of St. Peter's. There were, however, architects

FIG. 178.—INTERIOR OF SAN SEVERO, NAPLES.

of purer taste whose works even in that debased age were worthy of admiration.

BAROQUE CHURCHES. The Baroque style prevailed in church architecture for almost two centuries. The majority of the churches present varieties of the cruciform plan crowned by a high dome which is usually the best part of the design. The vices of the period appear in all other parts of these churches, especially in their façades and internal decoration. **S. M. della Vittoria,** by Maderna, and **Sta. Agnese,** by Borromini, both at Rome, are examples of the style. Naples is particularly full of Baroque churches (Fig. 178), a few of which, like the **Gesù Nuovo** (1584), are dignified and creditable designs. The domical church of **S. M. della Salute,** at Venice (1631), by *Longhena* (1604–1675), is also a majestic edifice in excellent style (Fig. 179), and here and there other churches offer exceptions to the prevalent baseness of architecture. Particularly objectionable was the wholesale disfigurement of existing monuments by ruthless remodelling, as in S. John Lateran, at Rome, the cathedrals of Ferrara, Palermo, Ravenna, and many others.

FIG. 179.—CHURCH OF S. M. DELLA SALUTE, VENICE.

PALACES. These were generally superior to the churches, and not infrequently impressive and dignified structures. The two best examples in Rome are the **P. Borghese,** by *Martino Lunghi the Elder* (1590), with a fine court arcade on coupled Doric and Ionic columns, and the **P. Barberini,** by Maderna and Borromini, with an elliptical staircase by Bernini, one of the few palaces in Italy with projecting lateral wings. In Venice, *Longhena*, in the **Rezzonico** and **Pesaro** palaces (1650–80), showed his freedom from the mannerisms of the age by reproducing successfully the ornate but dignified style of Sansovino (see p. 305). At Naples *D. Fontana*, whose works overlap the Baroque period, produced in the **Royal Palace** (1600) and the **Royal Museum** (1586-1615) designs of considerable dignity, in some respects superior to his papal residences in Rome. In suburban villas, like the **Albani** and **Borghese** villas near Rome, the ostentatious style of the Decline found free and congenial expression.

FOUNTAINS. To this period belong many of the monumental fountains erected in Rome, Messina, Viterbo, Bologna, Florence and other cities. Among these, two in Rome are worthy of especial mention: the **Fonte Felice** by D. Fontana (1585) and the **F. Paolina** (1611), by *Giov. Fontana.* The great Fontana di Trevi is a later work (see p. 310).

LATER MONUMENTS. In the few eighteenth-century buildings which are worthy of mention there is noticeable a reaction from the extravagances of the seventeenth century, shown in the dignified correctness of the exteriors and the somewhat frigid splendor of the interiors. The most notable work of this period is the **Royal Palace** at **Caserta,** by *Van Vitelli* (1752), an architect of considerable taste and inventiveness, considering his time. This great palace, 800 feet square, encloses four fine courts, and is especially remarkable for the simple if monotonous dignity of the well-proportioned exterior and the effective planning of its three octagonal vestibules, its ornate chapel and noble staircase.

Staircases, indeed, were among the most successful features of late Italian architecture, as in the **Scala Regia** of the Vatican, and in the Corsini, Braschi, and Barberini palaces at Rome, the Royal Palace at Naples, etc.

In church architecture the **east front** of **S. John Lateran*** in Rome, by *Galilei* (1734), and the whole **exterior** of **S. M. Maggiore,** by *Ferd. Fuga* (1743), are noteworthy designs: the former an especially powerful conception, combining a colossal order with two smaller orders in superposed *loggie*, but marred by the excessive scale of the balustrade and statues which crown it. The **Fountain** of **Trevi,** conceived in much the same spirit (1735, by *Niccola Salvi*), is a striking piece of decorative architecture. The **Sacristy** of **St. Peter's,** by *Marchionne* (1775), also deserves mention as a monumental and not uninteresting work. In the early years of the nineteenth century the **Braccio Nuovo** of the Vatican, by *Stern*, the imposing church of **S. Francesco di Paola** at Naples, by *Bianchi*, designed in partial imitation of the Pantheon, and the great **S. Carlo Theatre** at Naples, show the same coldly classical spirit, not wholly without merit, but lacking in true originality and freedom of conception.

CAMPANILES. The **campaniles** of the Renaissance and Decline deserve passing reference, though less important and interesting than other forms of Renaissance architecture. Some are simple square towers with pilasters; more often engaged columns and entablatures mark the several stories, and the upper portion is treated either with an octagonal lantern or with diminishing stages, and sometimes with a spire. Of the latter class the best example is that of S. Biagio, at Montepulciano,—one of the two designed to flank the façade of Ant. da S. Gallo's beautiful church of that name. One or two good late examples are to be found at Naples. Of the more massive square type there are ex-

* St. John Lateran follows the primitive basilican orientation, as does St. Peter's, instead of the later mediæval custom of fronting westwards.

amples in the towers of S. Michele, Venice; of the cathedral at Ferrara, Sta. Chiara at Naples, and Sta. Maria dell' Anima—one of the earliest—at Rome. The most complete and perfect of these square belfries of the Renaissance is that of the **Campidoglio** at Rome, by Martino Lunghi, dating from the end of the sixteenth century, which groups so admirably with the palaces of the Capitol. Venetia possesses a number of graceful and lofty bell-towers, generally of brick with marble bell-stages, of which the upper part of the **Campanile** of **St. Mark** (which fell in 1902; see p. 164) and the tower of **S. Giorgio Maggiore** are the finest examples.

IN CONCLUSION: The revival of the actual forms of ancient Roman architecture was only partially accomplished by the Italian architects of the Renaissance and then only for brief periods —during the latter half of the sixteenth century, and in a few buildings of the eighteenth. The architects of the early Renaissance did not attain to their aim of reviving Roman art; those of the Decline soon wearied of its restrictions. Their revolt would perhaps been less lawless had their predecessors not fallen into so mechanical a copying of antique forms—of the letter without the spirit of antique art.

MONUMENTS: (mainly in addition to those mentioned in the text). 15TH CENTURY—FLORENCE: Foundling Hospital (Innocenti), 1421; Old Sacristy and Cloister S. Lorenzo; P. Quaratesi, 1440; cloisters at Sta. Croce and Certosa, all by Brunelleschi; façade S. M. Novella, by Alberti, 1456; Badia at Fiesole, from designs of Brunelleschi, 1462; Court of P. Vecchio, by Michelozzi, 1464 (altered and enriched, 1565); P. Guadagni, by Cronaca, 1490; Hall of 500 in P. Vecchio, by same, 1495.—VENICE: S. Zaccaria, by Martino Lombardo, 1457-1515; S. Michele, by Moro Lombardo, 1466; S. M. del Orto, 1473; S. Giovanni Crisostomo, by Moro Lombardo, atrium of S. Giovanni Evangelista, Procurazie Vecchie, all 1481; Scuola di S. Marco, by Martino and Pietro Lombardo, 1490; P. Dario; P. Corner-Spinelli.—FERRARA: P. Schifanoja, 1469; P. Scrofa or Costabili, 1485; S. M. in Vado, P. dei Diamanti, P.

Bevilacqua, S. Francesco, S. Benedetto, S. Cristoforo, all 1490-1500.—MILAN: Ospedale Grande (or Maggiore), begun 1457 by Filarete, extended by Bramante, cir. 1480-90 (great court by Richini, 17th century); S. M. delle Grazie, E. end, Sacristy of S. Satiro, S. M. presso S. Celso, all by Bramante, 1477-1499.—ROME: S. Pietro in Montorio, 1472; S. M. del Popolo, 1475?; Sistine Chapel of Vatican, 1475; S. Agostino, 1483.—SIENNA: Loggia del Papa and P. Nerucci, 1460; P. del Governo, 1469-1500; P. Spannocchi, 1470; Sta. Catarina, 1490, by di Bastiano and Federighi, church later by Peruzzi; Library in cathedral by L. Marina, 1497; Oratory of S. Bernardino, by Turrapili, 1496.—PIENZA: Cathedral, Bishop's Palace (Vescovado), P. Pubblico, all cir. 1460, by B. di Lorenzo (or Rosselini?). ELSEWHERE (in chronological order): Arch of Alphonso, Naples, 1443, by P. di Martino; Oratory S. Bernardino, Perugia, by di Duccio, 1461; Church over Casa Santa, Loreto, 1465-1526; P. del Consiglio at Verona, by Fra Giocondo, 1476; Capella Colleoni, Bergamo, 1476; S. M. in Organo, Verona, 1481; Porta Capuana, Naples, by Giul. da Majano, 1484; Madonna della Croce, Crema, by B. Battagli, 1490-1556; Madonna di Campagna and S. Sisto, Piacenza, both 1492-1511; P. Bevilacqua, Bologna, by Nardi, 1492 (?); P. Gravina, Naples; P. Fava, Bologna; P. Pretorio, Lucca; S. M. dei Miracoli, Brescia; all at close of 15th century.

16TH CENTURY—ROME: P. Sora, 1501; S. M. della Pace and cloister, 1504, both by Bramante (façade of church by P. da Cortona, 17th century); S. M. di Loreto, 1507, by A. da San Gallo the Elder; P. Vidoni, by Raphael; P. Lante, 1520; Vigna Papa Giulio, 1534, by Peruzzi; P. dei Conservatori, 1540, and P. del Senatore, 1563 (both on Capitol), by M. Angelo, Vignola, and della Porta; Sistine Chapel in S. M. Maggiore, 1590; S. Andrea della Valle, 1591, by Olivieri (façade, 1670, by Rainaldi).—FLORENCE: Medici Chapel of S. Lorenzo, new sacristy of same, and Laurentian Library, all by M. Angelo, 1529-40; Mercato Nuovo, 1547, by B. Tasso; P. degli Uffizi, 1560-70, by Vasari; P. Giugni, 1560-8.—VENICE: P. Camerlinghi 1525, by Bergamasco; S. Francesco della Vigna, by Sansovino, 1539, façade by Palladio, 1568; Zecca or Mint, 1536, and Loggetta of Campanile, 1540, by Sansovino; Procurazie Nuove, 1584, by Scamozzi.—VERONA: Capella Pellegrini in S. Bernardino, 1514; City Gates, by Sammichele, 1530-40 (Porte Nuova, Stuppa, S. Zeno, S. Giorgio).—VICENZA: P. Porto, 1552; Teatro Olimpico, 1580; both by Palladio.—GENOA: P. Andrea

Doria, by Montorsoli, 1529; P. Ducale, by Pennone, 1550; P. Lercari, P. Spinola, P. Sauli, P. Marcello Durazzo, all by Gal. Alessi, cir. 1550; Sta. Annunziata, 1587, by della Porta; Loggia dei Banchi, end of 16th century.—ELSEWHERE (in chronological order): S. M. presso S. Celso, Milan, by Bramante and Alessi; P. Roverella, Ferrara, 1508; P. del Magnifico, Sienna, 1508, by Cozzarelli; P. Communale, Brescia, 1508, by Formentone; P. Albergati, Bologna, 1510; P. Ducale, Reggio-Gonzaga or Corte Reale, and Pal. della Giustizia, all in Mantua, 1520-40; P. Giustiniani, Padua, by Falconetto, 1524; Ospedale del Ceppo, Pistoia, 1525; Madonna delle Grazie, Pistoia, by Vitoni, 1535; P. Buoncampagni-Ludovisi, Bologna, 1545; Cathedral, Padua, 1550, by Ringhetti and della Valle, after M. Angelo; P. Bernardini, 1560, and P. Ducale, 1578, at Lucca, both by Ammanati.

17TH CENTURY: Chapel of the Princes in S. Lorenzo, Florence, 1604, by Nigetti; S. Pietro, Bologna, 1605; S. Andrea delle Fratte, Rome, 1612; Villa Borghese, Rome, 1616, by Vasanzio; P. Contarini delle Scrigni, Venice, by Scamozzi; Badia at Florence, rebuilt 1625 by Segaloni; S. Ignazio, Rome, 1626-85; Museum of the Capitol, Rome, 1644-50; Church of Gli Scalzi, Venice, 1649; P. Pesaro, Venice, by Longhena, 1650; P. Reale, Turin, 1660; S. Moisè, Venice, 1668; Brera Palace, Milan; P. Carignano, Turin, 1680; S. M. Zobenigo, Venice, 1680; Dogana di Mare, Venice, 1686, by Benone; Santi Apostoli, Rome.

18TH AND EARLY 19TH CENTURY: University, Turin, by Ricca, 1713; Gesuati, at Venice, 1715-30; P. Reale, Milan, 1772; S. Geremia, Venice, 1753, by Corbellini; P. Braschi, Rome, by Morelli, 1790; Nuova Fabbrica, Venice, 1810.

CHAPTER XXII.

RENAISSANCE ARCHITECTURE IN FRANCE.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: As before, Fergusson, Müntz, Palustre. Also Berty, *La Renaissance monumentale en France.* Blondel, *Architecture française.* Château, *Histoire et caractères de l'architecture en France.* Daly, *Motifs historiques d'architecture et de sculpture.* De Laborde, *La Renaissance des arts à la cour de France.* Du Cerceau, *Les plus excellents bastiments de France.* Lübke, *Geschichte der Renaissance in Frankreich.* Mathews, *The Renaissance under the Valois Kings.* Palustre, *La Renaissance en France.* Pattison, *The Renaissance of the Fine Arts in France.* Rouyer et Darcel, *L'Art architectural en France.* Sauvageot, *Choix de palais, châteaux, hôtels, et maisons de France*

ORIGIN AND CHARACTER. The vitality and richness of the Gothic style in France, even in its decline in the fifteenth century, long stood in the way of any general introduction of classic forms. When the Renaissance appeared, it came as a foreign importation, introduced from Italy by the king and the nobility. It underwent a protracted transitional phase, during which the national Gothic forms and traditions were picturesquely mingled with those of the Renaissance. The campaigns of Charles VIII. (1489), Louis XII. (1499), and Francis I. (1515), in vindication of their claims to the throne of Naples and the dukedom of Milan, brought these monarchs and their nobles into contact with the splendid material and artistic civilization of Italy, then in the full tide of the maturing Renaissance. They returned to France, filled with the ambition to rival the splendid palaces and gardens of Italy, taking with them Italian artists to teach their arts to the

French. But while these Italians successfully introduced many classic elements and details into French architecture, they wholly failed to dominate the French master-masons and *tailleurs de pierre* in matters of planning and general composition. The early Renaissance architecture of France is consequently wholly unlike the Italian, from which it derived only minor details and a certain largeness and breadth of spirit. It differs from the Italian also in being pre-eminently a royal and courtly style, dominated through much of its history by the taste and the architectural activity of a series of builder-monarchs.

PERIODS. The French Renaissance and its sequent developments may be broadly divided into three periods, with subdivisions coinciding more or less closely with various reigns, as follows:

I. The Valois Period, or Renaissance proper, 1483–1589, subdivided into:

a. The Transition, comprising the reigns of Charles VIII. and Louis XII. (1483–1515), and the early years of that of Francis I.; characterized by a picturesque mixture of classic details with Gothic conceptions.

b. The Style of Francis I., or Early Renaissance, from about 1520 to that king's death in 1547; distinguished by a remarkable variety and grace of composition and beauty of detail, with a gradual increase of classic forms.

c. The Advanced Renaissance, comprising the reigns of Henry II. (1547), Francis II. (1559), Charles IX. (1560), and Henry III. (1574–89); marked by a constant struggle between the increasing classical tendency and a more or less fantastic caprice.

II. The Bourbon or Classic Period (1589–1715):

a. Style of Henry IV., covering his reign and partly that of Louis XIII. (1610–45), employing the orders and other classic forms with a somewhat heavy, florid style of ornament.

b. Style of Louis XIV., beginning in the preceding reign and extending through that of Louis XIV. (1645–1715); the great age

of classic architecture in France, corresponding to the Palladian in Italy.

III. The Decline or Rococo Period, corresponding with the reign of Louis XV. (1715–74); marked by a fanciful and sometimes frivolous capriciousness of decoration.

During this period a reaction set in toward a severer classicism, leading to the styles of Louis XVI. and of the Empire, to be treated of in a later chapter. Through all these developments there appears a constant struggle between two tendencies: one, which may be called the Latin, toward classical correctness; the other, which we may for lack of a better designation call the Gallic, toward freedom from the traditional restraints. The progress from the free style of Francis I. to the formal correctness of that of Louis XIV. was marked by singular oscillations, and the struggle continues even in modern French art.

THE TRANSITION. As early as 1475 the new style made its appearance in altars, tombs, and rood-screens wrought by French carvers with the collaboration of Italian artificers. The tomb erected by Charles of Anjou to his father in Le Mans Cathedral (1475, by *Francesco Laurana*), the chapel of St. Lazare in the cathedral of Marseilles (1483), and the tomb of the children of Charles VIII. in Tours Cathedral (1506), by *Michel Columbe*, the greatest artist of his time in France, are examples. The schools of Rouen and Tours were especially prominent in works of this kind, marked by exuberant fancy and great delicacy of execution. In church architecture Gothic traditions were long dominant, in spite of the great numbers of Italian prelates in France. It was in *châteaux*, palaces, and dwellings that the new style achieved its most notable triumphs.

EARLY CHÂTEAUX. The castle of Charles VIII., at Amboise on the Loire, shows little trace of Italian influence. It was under Louis XII. that the transformation of French architecture really began. The **Château de Gaillon** (of which unfortunately only fragments remain in the École des Beaux-Arts at Paris),

built for the Cardinal George of Amboise, between 1497 and 1509, by *Pierre Fain*, was the masterwork of the Rouen school. It presented a curious mixture of styles, with its irregular plan, its moat, drawbridge, and round corner-towers, its high roofs, turrets, and dormers, which gave it, in spite of many Renaissance details, a mediæval picturesqueness. The **Château de Blois** (the east and south wings of the present group), begun for Louis XII. about 1500, was the first of a remarkable series of royal palaces which are the glory of French architecture. It shows the new influences in its horizontal lines and flat, unbroken façades of brick and stone, rather than in its architectural details (Fig. 180). The **Ducal Palace** at Nancy and the **Hôtel de Ville** at Orléans, by *Viart*, show a somewhat similar commingling of the classic and mediæval styles.

FIG. 180.—BLOIS, COURT FAÇADE OF WING OF LOUIS XII.

STYLE OF FRANCIS I. Under the lead of Italian artists, like il Rosso, Serlio, and Primaticcio, classic elements early began to dominate the general composition and Gothic details to disappear. A simple and effective system of exterior design was adopted in the castles and palaces of this period. Finely

moulded belt-courses at the sills and heads of the windows marked the different stories, and were crossed by a system of almost equally important vertical lines, formed by superposed pilasters flanking the windows continuously from basement to roof. The façade was crowned by a slight cornice and open balustrade, above which rose a steep and lofty roof, diversified by elaborate dormer windows which were adorned with gables and pinnacles (Fig. 181). Slender pilasters, treated like long panels ornamented with arabesques of great beauty, or with a species of baluster shaft* like a candelabrum, were preferred to columns, and were provided with graceful capitals of the Corinthianesque type. The mouldings were minute and richly carved; pediments were replaced by steep gables, and mullioned windows with stone crossbars were used in preference to the simpler Italian openings. In the earlier monuments Gothic details were still used occasionally; and round corner-towers, high dormers, and numerous turrets and pinnacles appear even in the châteaux of later date.

CHURCHES. Ecclesiastical architecture received but scant attention under Francis I., and, so far as it was practised, still clung tenaciously to Gothic principles. Among the few important churches of this period may be mentioned **St. Étienne du Mont,** at Paris (1517-38), in which classic and Gothic features appear in nearly equal proportions; the east end of **St. Pierre,** at Caen, with rich external carving; and the great parish church of **St. Eustache,** at Paris (1532, by *Pierre Lemercier*), in which the plan and construction are purely Gothic, while the details throughout belong to the new style, though with little appreciation of the spirit and proportions of classic art. New façades were also built for a number of already existing churches, among which **St. Michel,** at Dijon, is conspicuous, with its vast portal arch and

* Derived evidently from the decorations of the E. end of S. M delle Grazie at Milan and the mullion-candelabra in the grea windows of the Certosa at Pavia, as a result of Francis I.'s campaigns in Italy.

imposing towers. The Gothic towers of Tours Cathedral were completed with Renaissance lanterns or belfries, the northern in 1507, the southern in 1547.

PALACES. To the palace at Blois begun by his predecessor, Francis I. added a northern and a western wing, completing the court. The north wing is one of the masterpieces of the style, presenting toward the court a simple and effective composition, with a rich but slightly projecting cornice and a high roof with elaborate dormers. This façade is divided into two unequal sections by the open **Staircase Tower** (Fig. 181), a *chef-d'œuvre* in boldness of construction as well as in delicacy and richness of carving. The outer façade of this wing is a less ornate but more vigorous design, crowned by a continuous open loggia under the roof. More extensive than Blois was **Fontainebleau,** the favorite residence of the king and of many of his successors. Following in parts the irregular plan of the convent it replaced, its other portions were more symmetrically disposed, while the whole was treated externally in a somewhat severe, semi-classic style, singularly lacking in ornament. Internally, however, this palace, begun in 1528, by *Gilles Le Breton* (1495?–1552), was at that time the most splendid in France, the gallery of Francis I.

FIG. 181.—STAIRCASE TOWER, BLOIS.

being especially noted. The **Château** of **St. Germain,** near Paris (1539, by *Pierre Chambiges*, d. 1544), is of a very different character. Built largely of brick, with flat balustraded roof and deep buttresses carrying three ranges of arches, it is neither Gothic nor classic, neither fortress nor palace in aspect, but a wholly unique conception.



FIG. 182.—PLAN OF CHAMBORD.

The rural châteaux and hunting-lodges erected by Francis I. display the greatest diversity of plan and treatment, attesting the inventiveness of the French genius, expressing itself in a new-found language, whose formal canons it disdained. Chief among them is the **Château of Chambord** (Figs. 182, 183)—"a Fata Morgana in the midst of a wild, woody thicket," to use Lübke's language. This extraordinary edifice, resembling in plan a feudal castle with curtain-walls, bastions, moat, and donjon, is in its

FIG. 183.—ROOF OF CHAMBORD.

architectural treatment a palace with arcades, open stair-towers, a noble double spiral staircase terminating in a graceful lantern, and a roof of the most bewildering complexity of towers, chimneys and dormers (1526, by *Pierre le Nepveu*). The hunting-lodges of La Muette and Chalvau, and the so-called **Château de Madrid**—all three demolished during or since the Revolution—deserve mention, especially the last. This consisted of two rectangular pavilions, connected by a lofty banquet-hall, and adorned externally with arcades in Florentine style, and with medallions and reliefs of della Robbia ware (1527, by *Gadyer*).

THE LOUVRE. By far the most important of all the architectural enterprises of this reign, in ultimate results, if not in original extent, was the beginning of a new palace to replace the old Gothic fortified palace of the Louvre. To this task Pierre Lescot was summoned in 1542, and the work of erection actually begun in 1546. The new palace, in a sumptuous and remarkably dignified classic style, was to have covered precisely the area of the demolished fortress. Only the southwest half, comprising two sides of the court, was, however, undertaken at the outset (Fig. 184). It remained for later monarchs to amplify the original scheme, and ultimately to complete, late in the last century, the most extensive and beautiful of all the royal residences of Europe. (See Figs. 184, 186, 213.)

Want of space forbids more than a passing reference to the rural castles of the nobility, rivalling those of the king. Among them Bury, La Rochefoucauld, Bournazel, and especially **Azay-le-Rideau** (1520) and **Chenonceaux** (1515-23), may be mentioned, all displaying that love of rural pleasure, that hatred of the city and its confinement, which so distinguish the French from the Italian Renaissance.

OTHER BUILDINGS. The **Hôtel-de-Ville** (town hall), of Paris, begun during this reign, from plans by *Domenico di Cortona* (?), and completed under Henry IV., was the most important edifice of a class which in later periods numbered many interesting

structures. The town hall of **Beaugency** (1527) is one of the best of minor public buildings in France, and in its elegant treatment of a simple two-storied façade may be classed with the **Maison François I.,** at Paris. This stood formerly at Moret, whence it was transported to Paris and re-erected about 1830 in somewhat modified form. The large city houses of this period are legion; we can mention only the Hôtel Carnavalet at Paris; the Hôtel Bourgtheroude at Rouen; the Hôtel d'Écoville at Caen; the archbishop's palace at Sens, and a number of houses in Orléans. The **Tomb of Louis XII.,** at St. Denis, deserves especial mention for its fine proportions and beautiful arabesques.



FIG. 184.—DETAIL OF COURT OF LOUVRE, PARIS.

THE ADVANCED RENAISSANCE. By the middle of the sixteenth century the new style had lost much of its earlier charm. The orders, used with increasing frequency, were more and more conformed to antique precedents. Façades were flatter and simpler, cornices more pronounced, arches more Roman in treatment, and a heavier style of carving took the place of the delicate arabesques of the preceding age. The reigns of Henry II. (1547–59) and Charles IX. (1560–74) were especially distinguished by the labors of three celebrated architects: *Pierre Lescot*

(1515–78), who continued the work on the southwest angle of the Louvre; *Jean Bullant* (1515–78), to whom are due the right wing of Écouen and the porch of colossal Corinthian columns in the left wing of the same, built under Francis I.; and, finally, *Philibert de l'Orme* (1515–70). *Jean Goujon* (1510–72) also executed during this period most of the remarkable architectural sculptures which have made his name one of the most illustrious in the annals of French art. Chief among the works of de l'Orme was the palace of the **Tuileries,** built under Charles IX. for Cathérine de Médicis, not far from the Louvre, with which it was ultimately connected by a long gallery. Of the vast plan conceived for this palace, and comprising a succession of courts and wings, only a part of one side was erected (1564–72). This consisted of a domical pavilion, flanked by low wings only a story and a half high, to which were added two stories under Henry IV., to the great advantage of the design. Another masterpiece of his was the **Château d'Anet,** built in 1552 by Henry II. for Diane de Poitiers, of which, unfortunately, only fragments survive. This beautiful edifice, while retaining the semi-military moat and bastions of feudal tradition, was planned with classic symmetry, adorned with superposed orders, court arcades, and rectangular corner-pavilions, and provided with a domical cruciform chapel, the earliest of its class in France. All the details were unusually pure and correct, with just enough of freedom and variety to lend a charm wanting in later works of the period. To the reign of Henry II. belong also the châteaux of Ancy-le-Franc, Verneuil, Chantilly (the "petit château," by Bullant), the banquet-hall over the bridge at Chenonceaux (1556), several notable residences at Toulouse, and the tomb of Francis I. at St. Denis. The châteaux of **Pailly** and **Sully,** distinguished by the sobriety and monumental quality of their composition, in which the orders are important elements, belong to the reign of Charles IX., together with the Tuileries, already mentioned.

THE CLASSIC PERIOD: HENRY IV. Under this energetic

but capricious monarch (1589–1610) and his Florentine queen, Marie de Médicis, architecture entered upon a new period of activity and a new stage of development. Without the charm of the early Renaissance or the stateliness of the age of Louis XIV., it has a touch of the Baroque, attributable partly to the influence of Marie de Médicis and her Italian prelates, and partly to the Italian training of many of the French architects. The

FIG. 185.—THE LUXEMBURG, PARIS.*

great work of this period was the extension of the Tuileries by *J. B. du Cerceau*, and the completion, by *Métézeau* and others, of the long gallery next the Seine, begun under Henry II., with the view of connecting the Tuileries with the Louvre. In this part of the work colossal orders were used with indifferent effect. Next in importance was the addition to Fontainebleau of a great court to the eastward, whose relatively quiet and dignified style offers less contrast than one might expect to the other wings and courts dat-

* The façade here shown is modern, but reproduces the original garden-front as it was before the enlargement in 1842 to nearly double the original area.

ing from Francis I. More successful architecturally than either of the above was the **Luxemburg** palace, built for the queen by *Salomon DeBrosse*, in 1616 (Fig. 185). Its plan presents the favorite French arrangement of a main building separated from the street by a garden or court, the latter surrounded on three sides by low wings containing the dependencies. Externally, rusticated orders recall the garden-front of the Pitti at Florence; but the scale is smaller, and the projecting pavilions and high roofs give it a grace and picturesqueness wanting in the Florentine model. The **Place Royale,** at Paris, and the château of Beaumesnil, illustrate a type of brick-and-stone architecture much in vogue at this time, stone quoins decorating the windows and corners, and the orders being generally omitted.

Under Louis XIII. the Tuileries was extended northward and the Louvre as built by Lescot was doubled in size by the architect, *J. Lemercier*, the Pavillon de l'Horloge being added to form the centre of the enlarged court façade.

CHURCHES. To this reign belong also the most important churches of the period. The church of **St. Paul-St. Louis,** at Paris (1627, by *Derrand*), though disfigured by an overloaded and uninteresting front, is not without merit in its interior design and proportions. Its internal dome is the earliest in Paris. Far superior is the chapel of the **Sorbonne,** a well-designed domical church by *Jacques Lemercier* (1590–1654), with a sober and appropriate exterior treated with superposed orders. It was begun in 1635.

In the same general style, though built in the early part of the following reign, are the churches of **St. Roch** (1653), by *J. Lemercier* and *R. de Cotte*, and **St. Sulpice,** by *L. Levau* (*c.* 1660). The latter of the two is of imposing size. All four churches are marked by great dignity and simplicity of internal design. Constructed and vaulted wholly in stone, they avoid the pretentious sham and stucco of the contemporary Italian churches, but the lack of painted decorations renders them somewhat cold and severe in effect internally.

PERIOD OF LOUIS XIV. This was an age of remarkable literary and artistic activity, pompous and pedantic in many of its manifestations, but distinguished also by productions of a very high order. Although contemporary with the Italian Baroque—Bernini having been the guest of Louis XIV.—the architecture of this period was free from the wild extravagances of that style. In its often cold and correct dignity it resembled rather that of Palladio, making large use of the orders in exterior design, and tending rather to monotony than to overloaded decoration. In interior design there was more of lightness and caprice. Papier-maché and stucco were freely used in a fanciful style of relief ornamentation by scrolls, wreaths, shells, etc., and decorative panelling was much employed. The whole was saved from triviality only by the controlling lines of the architecture which framed it. But it was better suited to cabinet-work or to the prettinesses of the boudoir than to monumental interiors. The **Galerie d'Apollon,** built during this reign over the Petite Galerie in the Louvre, escapes this reproach, however, by the sumptuous dignity of its interior treatment.

VERSAILLES. This immense palace, built about an already existing villa of Louis XIII., was the work of *Levau* (1612–1670) and *J. H. Mansart* (1647–1708). Its erection, with the laying out of its marvellous park, almost exhausted the resources of the realm, but with results quite incommensurate with the outlay. In spite of its vastness, its exterior is commonplace; the orders are used with singular monotony, which is not redeemed by the deep breaks and projections of the main front. There is no controlling or dominant feature; there is no adequate entrance or approach; the grand staircases are badly placed and unworthily treated, and the different elements of the plan are combined with singular lack of the usual French sense of monumental and rational arrangement. The chapel is by far the best single feature in the design.

Far more successful was the completion of the Louvre, in 1688,

from the designs of *Claude Perrault* (1633–1688), the court physician, whose plans were fortunately adopted in preference to those of Bernini. For the east front he designed a magnificent Corinthian colonnade nearly 600 feet long, with coupled columns upon a plain high basement, and with a central pediment and terminal pavilions (Fig. 186). The whole forms one of the most imposing façades in existence; but it is a mere decoration, obviously designed for the adornment of the open square in front of it, and

FIG. 186.—COLONNADE OF LOUVRE.

having no practical relation to the building behind it. Its height required the addition of a third story to match it on the north and south sides of the court, which as thus completed quadrupled the original area proposed by Lescot. Fortunately the style of Lescot's work was retained throughout in the court façades, while externally the colonnade was recalled on the reconstructed south front by a colossal order of pilasters. The Louvre as completed by Louis XIV. was a stately and noble palace, as remarkable for the surpassing excellence of the sculptures of Jean Goujon as for the dignity and beauty of its architecture. Taken in connection with the Tuileries, it was unrivalled by any palace in Europe except the Vatican.

OTHER BUILDINGS. To Louis XIV. is also due the nobly planned but externally uninteresting **Hotel des Invalides** or veterans' asylum, at Paris, by *J. H. Mansart.* To the chapel of this institution was added, in 1680–1706, the celebrated **Dome** of the Invalides, a masterpiece by the same architect. In plan it somewhat resembles Bramante's scheme for St. Peter's—a Greek cross with domical chapels in the four angles and a dome over the centre. The exterior (Fig. 187), with the lofty gilded dome on a high drum adorned with engaged columns, is somewhat high for its breadth, but is a harmonious and impressive design; and the interior, if somewhat cold, is elegant and well proportioned. The chief innovation in the design was the wide separation of the interior stone dome from the lofty exterior decorative cupola and lantern of wood, this separation being designed to meet the conflicting demands of internal and external effect. To the same architect is due the formal monotony of the **Place Vendôme,** all the houses surrounding it being treated with a uniform architecture of colossal pilasters, at once monumental and inappropriate. One of the most pleasing



FIG. 187.—DOME OF THE INVALIDES.

designs of the time is the **Château de Maisons** (1658), by *F. Mansart* (1598–1666), uncle of J. H. Mansart. In this the proportions of the central and terminal pavilions, the mass and lines of the steep roof *à la Mansarde*, the simple and effective use of the orders, and the refinement of all the details impart a grace of aspect rare in contemporary works. The same qualities appear in his other works, as in the west wing at Blois for Gaston d'Orléans and in the **Val-de-Grâce,** begun by him in 1645 but continued and completed by *Lemercier*, *Le Muet* and *G. Le Duc*, a domical church of excellent proportions. Many important residences for persons of noble rank or large fortune were erected during this reign, among which may be mentioned the earlier portion of the **Palais Royal,** the **Hôtel Lambert** on the Ile St. Louis by Levau (1645), and the extension of the Hotel Carnavalet by F. Mansart. The want of space forbids mention of other buildings of this period.

FIG. 188.—FAÇADE OF ST. SULPICE, PARIS.

THE DECLINE. Under Louis XV. the pedantry of the classic period gave place to a protracted struggle between license and the severest classical correctness. The exterior designs of this time were often even more uninteresting and bare than under Louis XIV.; while, on the other hand, interior decoration tended towards an unregulated fancifulness in which straight lines and right angles almost disappeared and structural considerations

were ignored. There was originality and charm in much of this decoration, but it too often degenerated into a vulgar extravagance.

In public buildings of a seriously monumental character, however, this "rocaille" decoration was little used, and a severe classicism manifests itself throughout. The façade of **St. Sulpice** (Fig. 188) at Paris, built by *Servandoni* in 1755, onto the church already referred to on page 325, is a remarkably dignified and successful composition.



FIG. 189.—PLAN OF PANTHÉON, PARIS.

In the domical church of the **Panthéon** at Paris, begun in 1755, by *Soufflot* (1713–1781), the greatest ecclesiastical monument of its time in France, this classical correctness dominates the interior as well as the exterior. The four arms of the cross, measuring 362 × 267 feet, are dome-vaulted and provided with double aisles separated by Corinthian columns. The central dome, 69 feet in diameter, is 265 feet high, surrounded externally by a superb Corinthian peristyle. It comprises three shells, all of stone, the intermediate ovoid shell serving to support the lantern.* There is a noble portico of eighteen colossal Corinthian columns. The whole structure is notable for the cold perfection of its classic elegance.

PUBLIC SQUARES. Much attention was given to the embellishment of open spaces in the cities, for which the classic style was admirably suited. The most important work of this kind was that on the north side of the Place de la Concorde, Paris. This splendid square, perhaps, on the whole, the finest in Europe

* In the peristyle and the triple shell Soufflot evidently applied suggestion derived from St. Paul's, London (see p. 338, Fig. 193).

(though many of its best features belong to a later date), was at this time adorned with the two monumental colonnades by *Gabriel* (1698–1782). These colonnades, which form the decorative fronts for blocks of houses, deserve praise for the beauty of their proportions as well as for the excellent treatment of the arcade on which they rest, and of the pavilions at the ends.

FIG. 190.—EXTERIOR OF PANTHÉON, PARIS.

IN GENERAL. French Renaissance architecture is marked by good proportions and harmonious and appropriate detail. Its most interesting phase was unquestionably that of Francis I., so far, at least, as concerns exterior design. It steadily progressed, however, in its mastery of planning; and in its use of projecting pavilions crowned by dominant masses of roof, it succeeded in preserving, even in severely classic designs, a picturesqueness and variety otherwise impossible. Roofs, dormers, chimneys, and staircases it treated with especial success; and in these matters, as well as in monumental dispositions of plan, the French have largely retained their pre-eminence to our own day.

MONUMENTS: (Mainly supplementary to text. Ch. = château; P. = palace; C. = cathedral; Chu. = church; H. = hôtel; T. H. = town hall or *hôtel de ville*).

Transition: Ch. Blois, E. wing, 1499; Ch. Meillant; Ch. Chaumont; T. H. Amboise, 1502-05.

Francis I.: Ch. Nantouillet, 1517-25; Ch. Blois, W. wing (afterward demolished) and N. wing, 1520-30; H. Lallemant, Bourges, 1520; Ch. Villers-Cotterets, 1520-59; P. of Archbishop, Sens, 1521-35; P. Fontainebleau (Cour Ovale, Cour d'Adieux, Gallery Francis I., 1527-34; Peristyle, Chapel St. Saturnin, 1540-47, by *Gilles le Breton;* Cour du Cheval Blanc, 1527-31, by *P. Chambiges*); H. Bernuy, Toulouse, 1528-39; P. Granvelle, Besançon, 1532-40; T. H. Niort, T. H. Loches, 1532-43; H. de Ligeris (Carnavalet), Paris, 1544, by *P. Lescot;* churches of Gisors, nave and façade, 1530; La Dalbade, Toulouse, portal, 1530; St. Symphorien, Tours, 1531; Tillières, 1534-46.

Henry II., Charles IX.: Fontaine des Innocents, Paris, 1547-50, by *P. Lescot* and *J. Goujon;* tomb Francis I., at St. Denis, 1555, by *Ph. de l'Orme;* H. Catelan, Toulouse, 1555; tomb Henry II., at St. Denis, 1560; portal S. Michel, Dijon, 1564; Ch. Sully, 1567; T. H. Arras, 1573; P. Fontainebleau (Cour du Cheval Blanc remodelled, 1564-66, by *P. Girard;* Cour de la Fontaine, same date); T. H. Besançon, 1582; Ch. Charleval, 1585, by *J. B. de Cerceau.*

Styles of Henry IV. and Louis XIII.: P. Fontainebleau (Galerie des Cerfs, Chapel of the Trinity, Baptistery, etc.); P. Tuileries (Pav. de Flore, by *du Cerceau,* 1590-1610; long gallery continued); Hôtel Vogüé, at Dijon, 1607; Place Dauphine, Paris, 1608; P. de Justice, Paris, Great Hall, by *S. de Brosse,* 1618; H. Sully, Paris, 1624-39; P. Royal, Paris, by *J. Lemercier,* for Cardinal Richelieu, 1627-39; P. Louvre doubled in size, by the same; P. Tuileries (N. wing, and Pav. Marsan, long gallery completed); H. Lambert, Paris; T. H. Reims, 1627; Ch. Blois, W. wing for Gaston d'Orléans, by *F. Mansart,* 1635; façade St. Étienne du Mont, Paris, 1610; of St. Gervais, Paris, 1616-21, by *S. de Brosse.*

Style of Louis XIV.: T. H. Lyons, 1646; P. Louvre, E. colonnade and court completed, 1660-70; Tuileries altered by Le Vau, 1664; observatory at Paris, 1667-72; arch of St. Denis, Paris, 1672, by *Blondel;* Arch of St. Martin, 1674; by *Bullet;* Banque de France (Hôtel Toulouse), by *de Cotte,* H. de Luyne, H. Soubise (1708-40, partly by *Boffrand*), all in Paris; Ch. Chantilly; Ch. de Tanlay; P. St. Cloud; Place des Victoires, 1685; Chu. St. Sulpice, Paris, by *Le Vau* (façade, 1755); Chu. St. Roch, Paris, 1653, by

Lemercier and *de Cotte;* Notre Dame des Victoires, Paris, 1656, by *Le Muet* and *Bruant.*

The Decline: P. Bourbon, 1772 (by *Lassurance* and *Gabriel*); T. H. Rouen; Fontaine de Grenelle, by *Bouchardon,* 1739; Halle aux Blés (recently demolished), 1748; École Militaire, 1752-58, by *Gabriel;* P. Louvre, court completed, 1754, by the same; Madeleine begun, 1764 (redesigned and completed early in 19th century by *Vignon*); H. des Monnaies (Mint), by *Antoine;* École de Médecine, 1774, by *Gondouin;* P. Royal, Great Court, 1784, by *Louis;* Théâtre Français, 1784 (all the above at Paris); Grand Théâtre, Bordeaux, 1785-1800, by *Louis;* Préfecture at Bordeaux, by the same; Ch. de Compiègne, 1770, by *Gabriel;* P. Versailles, theatre by the same; H. Montmorency, Soubise, de Varennes, and the Petit Luxembourg, all at Paris, by *de Cotte;* public squares at Nancy, Bordeaux, Valenciennes, Rennes, Reims.

CHAPTER XXIII.

RENAISSANCE ARCHITECTURE IN GREAT BRITAIN AND THE NETHERLANDS.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: As before, Fergusson, Palustre. Also, Belcher and Macartney, *Later Renaissance Architecture in England.* Billings, *Baronial and Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Scotland.* Blomfield, *A Short History of Renaissance Architecture in England.* Britton, *Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain.* Campbell, *Vitruvius Britannicus.* Ewerbeck, *Die Renaissance in Belgien und Holland.* Galland, *Geschichte der Holländischen Baukunst im Zeitalter der Renaissance.* Gotch and Brown, *Architecture of the Renaissance in England.* Haupt, *Baukunst der Renaissance in Portugal.* Loftie, *Inigo Jones and Wren.* Nash, *Mansions of England.* Papworth, *Renaissance and Italian Styles of Architecture in Great Britain.* Richardson, *Architectural Remains of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I.* Schayes, *Histoire de l'architecture en Belgique.*

THE TRANSITION. The architectural activity of the sixteenth century in England was chiefly devoted to the erection of vast country mansions for the nobility and wealthy *bourgeoise.* In these seigniorial residences a degenerate form of the Gothic, known as the Tudor style, was employed during the reigns of Henry VII. and Henry VIII., and they still retained much of the feudal aspect of the Middle Ages. This style, with its broad, square windows and ample halls, was well suited to domestic architecture, as well as to collegiate buildings, of which a considerable number were erected at this time. Among the more important palaces and manor-houses of this period are the earlier parts of Hampton Court, Haddon and Hengreave Halls, and the now ruined castles of Raglan and Wolterton.

ELIZABETHAN STYLE. Under Elizabeth (1558–1603) the progress of classic culture and the employment of Dutch and Italian artists led to a gradual introduction of Renaissance forms, which, as in France, were at first mingled with others of Gothic origin. Among the foreign artists were the versatile Holbein from Germany, Trevigi and Torregiano from Italy, and Theodore Have, Bernard Jansen, and Gerard Chrismas from Holland. The pointed arch disappeared, and the orders began to be used as subordinate features in the decoration of doors, windows, chimneys and mantels. Open-work balustrades replaced externally the heavy Tudor battlements, and a peculiar style of carving in flat relief-patterns, resembling *appliqué* designs cut out with the jig-saw and attached by nails or rivets, was applied with little judgment to all possible features. Ceilings were commonly finished in plaster, with elaborate interlacing patterns in low relief; and this, with the increasing use of interior woodwork, gave to the mansions of this time a more homelike but less monumental aspect internally. English architects, like Smithson and Thorpe, now began to win the patronage at first monopolized by foreigners. In **Wollaton Hall** (1580), by Smithson, the orders were used for the main composition with mullioned windows, much after the fashion of **Longleat House,** completed a year earlier, by his master, John of Padua. During the following period, however (1590–1610), there was a reaction toward the Tudor practice, and the orders were again relegated to subordinate uses. Of their more monumental employment, the **Gate of Honor** of Caius College, Cambridge, is one of the earliest examples. Hardwicke and Charlton Halls, and Burghley (Fig. 191), Hatfield, and Holland Houses are noteworthy monuments of the style.

JACOBEAN STYLE. During the reign of James I. (1603–25), details of classic origin came into more general use, but caricatured almost beyond recognition. The orders, though much employed, were treated without correctness or grace, and the ornament was unmeaning and heavy. It is not worth while to dwell

further upon this style, which produced no important public buildings, and soon gave way to a more rigid classicism.

CLASSIC PERIOD. If the classic style was late in its appearance in England, its final sway was complete and long-lasting. It was *Inigo Jones* (1572–1652) who first introduced the correct and monumental style of the Italian masters of classic design. For Palladio, indeed, he seems to have entertained a sort of ven-

FIG. 191.—BURGHLEY HOUSE.

eration, and the villa which he designed at Chiswick was a reduced copy of Palladio's Villa Capra, near Vicenza. This and other works of his show a failure to appreciate the unsuitability of Italian conceptions to the climate and tastes of Great Britain; his efforts to popularize Palladian architecture, without the resources which Palladio controlled in the way of decorative sculpture and painting, were consequently not always happy in their results. His greatest work was the design for a new **Palace at Whitehall,** London. Of this colossal scheme, which, if com-

pleted, would have ranked as the grandest palace of the time, only the **Banqueting Hall** (now used as a museum) was ever built (Fig. 192). It is an effective composition in two stories, rusticated throughout and adorned with columns and pilasters, and contains a fine vaulted hall in three aisles. The plan of the palace, which was to have measured 1,152 × 720 feet, was excellent, largely conceived and carefully studied in its details, but it was wholly beyond the resources of the kingdom. The garden-front of **Somerset House** (1632; demolished) had the same qualities of simplicity and dignity, recalling the works of Sammichele. Wilton House, Coleshill, the villa at Chiswick, and St. Paul's, Covent Garden, are the best known of his works, showing him to have been a designer of ability, but hardly of the consummate genius which his admirers attribute to him.

FIG. 192.—BANQUETING HALL, WHITEHALL.

ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL. The greatest of Jones's successors was *Sir Christopher Wren* (1632–1723), principally known as the architect of **St. Paul's Cathedral,** London, built to replace the earlier Gothic cathedral destroyed in the great fire of 1666. It was begun in 1675, and its designer had the rare good fortune to witness its completion in 1710. The plan, as finally adopted, retained the general proportions of an English Gothic church, measuring 480 feet in length, with transepts 250 feet long, and a grand rotunda 108 feet in diameter at the crossing (Fig. 193).

The style was strictly Italian, treated with sobriety and dignity, if somewhat lacking in variety and inspiration. Externally two stories of the Corinthian order appear, the upper story being merely a screen to hide the clearstory and give greater height and mass to the long exterior of the cathedral,—an architectural pretense hardly atoned for by any special beauty of detail. The dominant feature of the design is the dome over the central area.



FIG. 193.—PLAN OF ST. PAUL'S, LONDON.

It consists of an inner shell, reaching a height of 216 feet, above which rises the exterior dome of wood, surmounted by a stone lantern, the summit of which is 360 feet from the pavement (Fig. 194). This exterior dome, springing from a high drum surrounded by a magnificent peristyle, gives to the otherwise somewhat commonplace exterior of the cathedral a signal majesty of effect. Next to the dome the most successful part of the design is the west front, with its two-storied porch and flanking bell-turrets. Internally the excessive relative length, especially that of the choir, detracts from the effect of the dome, and the interior detail lacks distinction. The much discussed mosaic decoration of the choir, added in recent years, has somewhat relieved the former bareness of this interior. The central area itself, in spite of the awkward treatment of the four smaller arches of the eight which support the dome, is a noble design, occupying the whole width of the three aisles, like the Octagon at Ely (see p. 228), and producing a striking effect of amplitude and grandeur. The dome above it is constructively interesting from the employment of a cone of brick masonry to support the stone lantern which rises above the exterior wooden shell.

The lower part of the cone forms the drum of the inner dome, its contraction upward being intended to produce a perspective illusion of increased height.

St. Paul's ranks among the five or six greatest domical buildings of Europe, and is the most imposing modern edifice in England.

WREN'S OTHER WORKS. Wren was conspicuously successful in the designing of parish churches in London. **St. Stephen's,** Walbrook, is the most admired of these, with a dome resting on eight columns. Wren may be called the inventor of the English Renaissance type of steeple, in which a conical or pyramidal spire is harmoniously added to a belfry on a square tower with classic details. The steeple of **Bow Church,** Cheapside, is the most successful example of the type. In secular architecture Wren's most important works were the plan for rebuilding London after the Great Fire; the new courtyard of Hampton Court, a quiet and

FIG. 194.—EXTERIOR OF ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL.

dignified composition in brick and stone; the pavilions and colonnade of **Greenwich Hospital**; the Sheldonian Theatre at Oxford, and the Trinity College Library at Cambridge. Without profound originality, these works testify to the sound good taste and intelligence of their designer.

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. The Anglo-Italian style as used by Jones and Wren continued in use through the eighteenth century, during the first half of which a number of important country-seats and some churches were erected. *Van Brugh* (1666–1726), *Hawksmoor* (1666–1736), and *Gibbs* (1683–1754) were then the leading architects. Van Brugh was especially skilful in his dispositions of plan and mass, and produced in the designs of Blenheim and Castle Howard effects of grandeur and variety of perspective hardly equalled by any of his contemporaries in France or Italy. **Blenheim,** with its monumental plan and the sweeping curves of its front (Fig. 195), has an unusually palatial aspect, though the striving for picturesqueness is carried too far. Castle Howard is simpler, depending largely for effect on a somewhat inappropriate dome. To Hawksmoor, his pupil, are due **St. Mary's, Woolnoth** (1715), at London, in which by a bold rustication of the whole exterior and by windows set in large recessed arches he was enabled to dispense wholly with the orders; St. George's, Bloomsbury; the new quadrangle of All Souls at Oxford, and some minor works. The two most noted designs of James Gibbs are **St. Martin's-in-the-Fields,** at London (1726), and the **Radcliffe Library,** at Oxford (1747). In the former the use of a Corinthian portico and of a steeple apparently mounted on the



FIG. 195.—PLAN OF BLENHEIM.

roof, with no visible lines of support from the ground, though open to criticism, adds greatly to the splendor of the edifice, which is marked by excellent proportions and general harmony and appropriateness of design (Fig. 196). The Radcliffe Library is a circular domical hall surrounded by a lower circuit of alcoves and rooms, the whole treated with straightforward simplicity and excellent proportions. Colin Campbell, Flitcroft, Kent and Wood, contemporaries of Gibbs, may be dismissed with passing mention.

FIG. 196.—ST. MARTIN'S-IN-THE-FIELDS, LONDON.

Sir William Chambers (1726–96) was the greatest of the later eighteenth-century architects. His fame rests chiefly on his *Treatise on Civil Architecture*, and the extension and remodelling of **Somerset House,** in which he retained the general *ordonnance* of Inigo Jones's design, adapting it to a frontage of some 600 feet. *Robert Adam*, the designer of Keddlestone Hall and of **Edinburgh University;** the two *Dances*, who designed the Mansion House and Newgate Prison, at London—the latter a vigorous and appropriate composition without the orders (recently demolished)—and *Sir John Soane*, the architect of the Bank of England, close the list of noted architects of the eighteenth century. It was a period singularly wanting in artistic creative-

ness and spontaneity; its productions were nearly all respectable, and often dignified, but without charm.

BELGIUM. As in all other countries where the late Gothic style had been highly developed, Belgium was slow to accept the principles of the Renaissance in art. Long after the dawn of the sixteenth century the Flemish architects continued to employ their highly florid Gothic alike for churches and town-halls, with which they chiefly had to do. The earliest Renaissance buildings date from 1530–40, among them being the Hôtel du Saumon at Malines, at Bruges the Ancien Greffe, by *Jean Wallot*, and at Liège the **Archbishop's Palace,** by *Borset*. The last named, in the singular and capricious form of the arches and baluster-like columns of its court, reveals the taste of the age for what was *outrê* and odd; a taste partly due, no doubt, to Spanish influences, as Belgium was in reality from 1506 to 1712 a Spanish province, and there was more or less interchange of artists between the two countries. The **Hôtel de Ville,** at Antwerp, by *Cornelius de Vriendt* or *Floris* (1518–75), erected in 1565, is the most important monument of the Renaissance in Belgium. Its façade, 305 feet long and 102 feet high, in four stories, is an impressive creation in spite of its somewhat monotonous fenestration and the inartistic repetition in the third story of the composition and proportions of the second. The basement story forms an open arcade, and an open colonnade or loggia runs along under the roof, thus imparting to the composition a considerable play of light and shade, enhanced by the picturesque central pavilion which rises to a height of six stories in diminishing stages. The style is almost Palladian in its severity, but in general the Flemish architects disdained the restrictions of classic canons, preferring a more florid and fanciful effect than could be obtained by mere combinations of Roman columns, arches and entablatures. De Vriendt's other works were mostly designs for altars, tabernacles and the like; among them the rood-screen in Tournay Cathedral. His influence may be traced in the Hôtel de Ville at Flushing (1594).

The ecclesiastical architecture of the Flemish Renaissance is almost as destitute of important monuments as is the secular. **Ste. Anne,** at Bruges, fairly illustrates the type, which is characterized in general by heaviness of detail and a cold and bare aspect internally. The Renaissance in Belgium is best exemplified, after all, by minor works and ordinary dwellings, many of which have considerable artistic grace, though they are quaint rather than monumental (Fig. 197). Stepped gables, high dormers, and volutes flanking each diminishing stage of the design, give a certain piquancy to the street architecture of the period.



FIG. 197.—RENAISSANCE HOUSES, BRUSSELS.

HOLLAND. Except in the domain of realistic painting, the Dutch have never manifested pre-eminent artistic endowments, and the Renaissance produced in Holland few monuments of consequence. It began there, as in many other places, with minor works in the churches, due largely to Flemish or Italian artists. About the middle of the sixteenth century two native architects, *Sebastian van Noye* and *William van Noort*, first popularized the use of carved pilasters and of gables or steep pediments adorned with carved scallop-shells, in remote imitation of the style of Francis I. The principal monuments of the age were town-halls, and, after the war of independence in which the yoke of Spain was finally broken (1566–79), local administrative buildings—mints, exchanges and the like. The **Town Hall** of **The Hague** (1565), with its

stepped gable or great dormer, its consoles, statues, and octagonal turrets, may be said to have inaugurated the style generally followed after the war. Owing to the lack of stone, brick was almost universally employed, and stone imported by sea was only used in edifices of exceptional cost and importance. Of these the **Town Hall** at Amsterdam holds the first place. Its façade is of about the same dimensions as the one at Antwerp, but compares unfavorably with it in its monotony and want of interest. The **Leyden Town Hall,** by the Fleming, *Lieven de Key* (1597), the Bourse or Exchange and the Hanse House at Amsterdam, by *Hendrik de Keyser*, the Weighing House at Alkmaar and the Market at Haarlem, are also worthy of mention, though many lesser buildings, built of brick combined with enamelled terra-cotta and stone, possess quite as much artistic merit.

DENMARK. In Denmark the monuments of the Renaissance may almost be said to be confined to the reign of Christian IV. (1588–1648), and do not include a single church of any importance. The royal castles of the **Rosenborg** (1610) and Christiansborg (1731) at Copenhagen, and the **Fredericksborg** (1580–1624), the latter by a Dutch architect, are interesting and picturesque in mass, with their fanciful gables, mullioned windows and numerous turrets, but can hardly lay claim to beauty of detail or purity of style. The Exchange at Copenhagen, built of brick and stone in the same general style (1619–40), is still less interesting both in mass and detail.

The only other important Scandinavian monument deserving of special mention in so brief a sketch as this is the **Royal Palace** at **Stockholm,** Sweden (1698-1753), due to a foreign architect, *Nicodemus de Tessin.* It is of imposing dimensions, and although simple in external treatment, it merits praise for the excellent disposition of its plan, its noble court, imposing entrances, and the general dignity and appropriateness of its architecture.

MONUMENTS: (in addition to those mentioned in text). ENGLAND, TUDOR STYLE: Several palaces by Henry VIII., no longer extant; Westwood, later rebuilt; Gosfield Hall; Harlaxton.—ELIZABETHAN: Buckhurst, 1565; Kirby House, 1570, both by Thorpe; Caius College, 1570-75, by Theodore Have; "The Schools," Oxford, by Thomas Holt, 1600; Beaupré Castle, 1600.—JACOBEAN: Tombs of Mary of Scotland and of Elizabeth in Westminster Abbey; Audsley Inn; Bolsover Castle, 1613; Heriot's Hospital, Edinburgh, 1628.—CLASSIC or ANGLO-ITALIAN: St. John's College, Oxford; Queen's House, Greenwich; Coleshill; all by Inigo Jones, 1620-51; Amesbury, by Webb; Combe Abbey; Buckingham and Montague Houses; The Monument, London, 1670, by Wren; Temple Bar, by the same; Winchester Palace, 1683; Chelsea College; Towers of Westminster Abbey, 1696; St. Clement Dane's; St. James's, Westminster; St. Peter's, Cornhill, and many others, all by Wren.—18TH CENTURY: Seaton Delaval and Grimsthorpe, by Van Brugh; Chatsworth; Wanstead House, by Colin Campbell; Treasury Buildings, by Kent.

The most important Renaissance buildings of BELGIUM and HOLLAND have been mentioned in the text.

CHAPTER XXIV.

RENAISSANCE ARCHITECTURE IN GERMANY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: As before, Fergusson, Palustre. Also, von Bezold, *Die Baukunst der Renaissance in Deutschland, Holland, Belgien und Dänemark* (in *Hdbuch. d. Arch.*). Ewerbeck, *Die Renaissance in Belgien und Holland.* Caveda (tr. Kugler), *Geschichte der Baukunst in Spanien.* Fritsch, *Denkmäler der deutschen Renaissance* (plates). Galland, *Die Renaissance in Holland.* Haupt, *Baukunst der Renaissance in Portugal.* Junghändel, *Die Baukunst Spaniens.* Lambert und Stahl, *Motive der deutschen Architektur.* Lübke, *Geschichte der Renaissance in Deutschland.* Ortwein, *Deutsche Renaissance.* Prentice, *Renaissance Architecture and Ornament in Spain.* Uhde, *Baudenkmäler in Spanien.* Verdier et Cattois, *Architecture civile et domestique.* Villa Amil, *Hispania Artística y Monumental.*

AUSTRIA: BOHEMIA. The earliest appearance of the Renaissance in the architecture of the German states was in the eastern provinces. Before the close of the fifteenth century Florentine and Milanese architects were employed in Austria, Bohemia, and the Tyrol, where there are a number of palaces and chapels in an unmixed Italian style. The portal of the castle of Mahrisch-Trübau dates from 1492; while to the early years of the sixteenth century belong a cruciform chapel at Gran, the remodelling of the castle at Cracow, and the chapel of the Jagellons in the same city—the earliest domical structure of the German Renaissance, though of Italian design. The **Schloss Porzia** (1510), at Spital in Carinthia, is a fine quadrangular palace, surrounding a court with arcades on three sides, in which the open stairs form a picturesque interruption with their ram-

pant arches. But for the massiveness of the details it might be a Florentine palace. In addition to this, the famous **Arsenal** at Wiener-Neustadt (1524), the portal of the Imperial Palace at Vienna (1552), and the **Castle Schalaburg** on the Danube (1530-1601), are attributed to Italian architects, to whom must also be ascribed a number of important works at Prague. Chief among these the **Belvedere** (1536, by *Paolo della Stella*), a rectangular building surrounded by a graceful open arcade, above which it rises with a second story crowned by a curved roof; the Waldstein Palace (1621-29), by *Giov. Marini*, with its imposing loggia; **Schloss Stern,** built on the plan of a six-pointed star (1459-1565) and embellished by Italian artists with stucco ornaments and frescoes; and parts of the palace on the Hradschin, by *Scamozzi*, attest the supremacy of Italian art in Bohemia. The same is true of Styria, Carinthia, and the Tyrol; *e.g.* **Schloss Ambras** at Innsbrück (1570).

GERMANY: PERIODS. The earliest manifestation of the Renaissance in what is now the German Empire, appeared in the works of painters like Dürer and Burkmair, and in occasional buildings previous to 1525. The real transformation of German architecture, however, hardly began until after the Peace of Augsburg, in 1555. From that time on its progress was rapid, its achievements being almost wholly in the domain of secular architecture—princely and ducal castles, town halls or *Rathhäuser*, and houses of wealthy burghers or corporations. The Empire was a mere abstraction; Germany was really a loose bundle of small states, most of them having but limited resources, so that anything like an imperial or royal architecture was impossible. The palaces grew up at haphazard about nuclei of mediæval origin, with no single portion to compare with the stately châteaux of the French kings. Church architecture was neglected, owing to the Reformation, which turned to its own uses the existing churches, while the Roman Catholics were too impoverished to replace the edifices they had lost.

The periods of the German Renaissance are less well marked than those of the French; but its successive developments follow the same general progression, divided into three stages:

I. The Early Renaissance, 1525–1600, in which the orders were infrequently used, mainly for porches and for gable decoration. The conception and spirit of most monuments were still strongly tinged with Gothic feeling.

II. The Late Renaissance, 1600–1675, characterized by a dry, heavy treatment, in which too often neither the fanciful gayety of the previous period nor the simple and monumental dignity of classic design appears. Broken curves, large scrolls, obelisks, and a style of flat relief carving resembling the Elizabethan are common. Occasional monuments exhibit a more correct and classic treatment after Italian models.

III. The Decline or Baroque Period, 1675–1800, employing the orders in a style of composition oscillating between the extremes of bareness and of Rococo over-decoration. The ornament partakes of the character of the Louis XV. and Italian Jesuit styles, being most successful in interior decoration, but externally running sometimes to the extreme of unrestrained fancy.

CHARACTERISTICS. In none of these periods do we meet with the sober, monumental treatment of the Florentine or Roman schools. A love of picturesque variety in masses and sky-lines, inherited from mediæval times, appears in the high roofs, stepped gables and lofty dormers which are universal. The roofs often comprise several stories, and are lighted by lofty gables at either end, and by dormers carried up from the side walls through two or three stories. Gables and dormers alike are built in diminishing stages, each step adorned with a console or scroll, and the whole treated with pilasters or colonnettes and entablatures breaking over each support (Fig. 198). These roofs, dormers, and gables contribute the most noticeable element to the general effect of German Renaissance build-

ings, and are commonly the best-designed features in them. The orders are scantily used and usually treated with utter disregard of classic canons, being generally far too massive and overloaded with ornament. Oriels, bay windows, and turrets, starting from corbels or colonnettes, or rarely from the ground, diversify the façade, and spires of curious bulbous patterns give added piquancy to the picturesque skyline. The plans seldom had the monumental symmetry and largeness of Italian and French models; courtyards were often irregular in shape and diversified with balconies and spiral staircase turrets. The national leaning was always toward the quaint and fantastic, as well in the decoration as in the composition. Grotesques, caryatids, *gaînes* (half-figures terminating below in sheath-like supports), fanciful rustication, and many other details give a touch of the Baroque even to works of early date. The same principles were applied with better success to interior decoration, especially in the large halls of the castles and town-halls, and many of their ceilings were sumptuous and well-

FIG. 198.—SCHLOSS HÄMELSCHENBURG.

considered designs, deeply panelled, painted and gilded, in wood or plaster.

CASTLES. The *Schloss* or *Burg* of the German prince or duke retained throughout the Renaissance many mediæval characteristics in plan and aspect. A large proportion of these noble residences were built upon foundations of demolished feudal castles, reproducing in a new dress the ancient round towers and vaulted guard-rooms and halls, as in the Hartenfels at Torgau, the Heldburg (both in Saxony), and the castle of Trausnitz, in Bavaria, among many others. The **Castle** at **Torgau** (1540) is one of the most imposing of its class, with massive round and square towers showing externally, and court façades full of picturesque irregularities. In the great **Castle** at **Dresden** the plan is more symmetrical, and the Renaissance appears more distinctly in the details of the Georgenflügel (1530–50), though at that early date the classic orders were almost ignored. The portal of the Heldburg, however, built in 1562, is a composition quite in the contemporary French vein, with superposed orders and a crowning pediment over a massive basement.

Another important series of castles or palaces are of more regular design, in which the feudal traditions tend to disappear. The majority belong to the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries. They are built around large rectangular courts with arcades in two or three stories on one or more sides, but rarely surrounding it entirely. In these the segmental arch is more common than the semicircular, and springs usually from short and stumpy Ionic or Corinthian columns. The rooms and halls are arranged *en suite*, without corridors, and a large and lofty banquet hall forms the dominant feature of the series. The earliest of these regularly planned palaces are of Italian design. Chief among them is the **Residenz** at **Landshut** (1536–43), with a thoroughly Roman plan, by pupils of Giulio Romano, and exterior and court façades of great dignity treated

with the orders. More German in its details, but equally interesting, is the **Fürstenhof** at **Wismar,** in brick and terra-cotta, by *Valentino di Lira* and *Van Aken* (1553); while in the **Piastenschloss** at Brieg (1547–72), by Italian architects, the treatment in parts suggests the richest works of the style of Francis I. In other castles the segmental arch and stumpy columns or piers show the German taste, as in the **Plassenburg,** by *Kaspar Vischer* (1554–64), the castle at Plagnitz, and the **Old Castle** at **Stuttgart,** all dating from about 1550–55. **Heidelberg Castle,** in spite of its mediæval aspect from the river and its irregular plan, ranks as the highest achievement of the German Renaissance in palace design. The most interesting parts among its various wings built at different dates—the earlier portions still Gothic in design—are the **Otto Heinrichsbau** (1554) and the **Friedrichsbau** (1601). The first of these appears somewhat simpler in its lines than the second, by reason of having lost its original dormer gables. The orders, freely treated, are superposed in three stories, and twin windows, niches, statues, *gaînes*, medallions

FIG. 199.—THE FRIEDRICHSBAU, HEIDELBERG.

and profuse carving produce an effect of great gayety and richness. The Friedrichsbau (Fig. 199) less quiet in its lines, and with high scroll-gabled and stepped dormers, is on the other hand more soberly decorated and more characteristically German. The Schloss Hämelschenburg (Fig. 198) is designed in somewhat the same spirit, but with even greater simplicity of detail.

TOWN HALLS. These constitute the most interesting class of Renaissance buildings in Germany, presenting a considerable variety of types, but nearly all built in solid blocks without courts, and adorned with towers or spires. A high roof crowns the building, broken by one or more high gables or many-storied dormers. The majority of these town halls present façades much diversified by projecting wings, as at Lemgo and Paderborn, or by oriels and turrets, as at **Altenburg** (1562–64); and the towers which dominate the whole terminate usually in bell-shaped cupolas, or in more capricious forms with successive swellings and contractions, as at Dantzic (1587). A few, however, are designed with monumental simplicity of mass; of these that at **Bremen** (1612) is perhaps the finest, with its beautiful exterior arcade on strong Doric columns. The town hall of Nuremberg is one of the few with a court, and presents a façade of almost Roman simplicity (1613–19); that at **Augsburg** (1615) is equally classic and more pleasing; while at Schweinfurt, Rothenburg (1572), Mülhausen, etc., are others worthy of mention.

CHURCHES. **St. Michael's,** at Munich, is almost the only important church of the first period in Germany (1582), but it is worthy to rank with many of the most notable contemporary Italian churches. A wide nave, covered by a majestic barrel vault, is flanked by side chapels, separated from each other by massive piers and forming a series of gallery bays above. There are short transepts and a choir, all in excellent proportion and treated with details which, if somewhat heavy, are appropriate and reasonably correct. The **Marienkirche** at Wolfenbüttel

(1608) is a fair sample of the parish churches of the second period. In the exterior of this church pointed arches and semi-Gothic tracery are curiously associated with heavy rococo carving. The simple rectangular mass, square tower, and portal with massive orders and carving are characteristic features. Many of the church-towers are well proportioned and graceful structures in spite of the fantastic outlines of their spires. One of the best and purest in style is that of the University Church at Würzburg (1587–1600).

FIG. 200.—ZWINGER PALACE, DRESDEN.

HOUSES. Many of the German houses of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries would merit extended notice in a larger work, as among the most interesting lesser monuments of the Renaissance. Nuremberg and Hildesheim are particularly rich in such houses, built either for private citizens or for guilds and corporations. Not a few of the half-timbered houses of the time are genuine works of art, though interest chiefly centres in the more monumental dwelling of stone. In this domestic architecture the picturesque quality of German design appears to better advantage than in more monumental edifices, and their broadly stepped gables, corbelled oriels, florid portals and want of formal symmetry imparting a peculiar and undeniable charm.

The Kaiserhaus and Wedekindsches Haus at Hildesheim; **Fürstenhaus** at Leipzig; Peller, Hirschvogel, and Funk houses at Nuremberg; the Salt House at Frankfurt, and Ritter House at Heidelberg, are a few of the most noted among these examples of domestic architecture.



FIG. 201.—CHURCH OF ST. MARY (MARIENKIRCHE), DRESDEN.

LATER MONUMENTS. The **Zwinger Palace** at Dresden (1711–22), by *Pöppelmann* (Fig. 200), is the most elaborate and wayward example of the German palace architecture of the third period. Its details are of the most exaggerated rococo type, like confectioner's work done in stone; and yet the building has an air of princely splendor which partly atones for its details. Besides this palace, Dresden possesses in the domical **Marienkirche** (Fig. 201) a very meritorious example of late design. The proportions are good, and the detail, if not interesting, is at least inoffensive, while the whole is externally a dignified and rational piece of work. At Vienna are a number of palaces of the third period, more interesting for their beautiful grounds and parks than for intrinsic architectural merit, except in some of the interiors where, as notably in the superb **Imperial Library** by *Fischer von Erlach* (1650–1723) the wayward

capriciousness of the Rococo style was turned to splendid decorative account. As in Italy, this was the period of stucco, and although in Vienna this cheap and perishable material was cleverly handled, and the ornament produced was often quaint and effective, the results lack the permanence and dignity of true building in stone or brick, and may be dismissed without further mention.

In minor works the Germans were far less prolific than the Italians or Spaniards. Few of their tombs were of the first importance, though one, the **Sebald Shrine,** in Nuremberg, by *Peter Vischer* (1506–19), is a splendid work in bronze, in the transitional style; a richly decorated canopy on slender metal colonnettes covering and enclosing the sarcophagus of the saint. There are a large number of fountains in the squares of German and Swiss cities which display a high order of design, and are among the most characteristic minor products of German art.

SPAIN. The flamboyant Gothic style sufficed for a while to meet the requirements of the arrogant and luxurious period which in Spain followed the overthrow of the Moors and the discovery of America. But it was inevitable that the Renaissance should in time make its influence felt in the arts of the Iberian peninsula, largely through the employment of Flemish artists. In jewelry and silverwork, arts which received a great impulse from the importation of the precious metals from the New World, the forms of the Renaissance found special acceptance so that the new style received the name of the *Plateresque* (from *platero*, silversmith). This was a not inept name for the minutely detailed and sumptuous decoration of the early Renaissance, which lasted from 1500 to the accession of Philip II. in 1556. It was characterized by surface-decoration spreading over broad areas, especially around doors and windows, florid escutcheons and Gothic details mingling with delicately chiselled arabesques. Decorative pilasters with broken entablatures and carved balus-

ter-shafts were employed with little reference to constructive lines, but with great refinement of detail, in spite of the exuberant profusion of the ornament.

To this style, after the artistic inaction of Philip II.'s reign, succeeded the coldly classic style practised by *Berruguete* and *Herrera* (1530–1597), and called the *Griego-Romano*. In spite of the attempt to produce works of classical purity, the buildings of this period are for the most part singularly devoid of originality and interest. This style lasted until the middle of the seventeenth century, and in the case of certain works and artists, until its close. It was followed, at least in ecclesiastical architecture, by the so-called *Churrigueresque*, a name derived from an otherwise insignificant architect, *Churriguera* (died 1725), who like Maderna and Borromini in Italy, discarded all the proprieties of architecture, and rejoiced in the wildest extravagances of an untrained fancy and debased taste. About the middle of the eighteenth century, however, the advent of a number of Italian architects resulted in a return toward classical correctness.

EARLY MONUMENTS. The earliest ecclesiastical works of the Renaissance period, like the cathedrals of Salamanca, and Segovia, were almost purely Gothic in style. Not until 1525 did the new forms begin to dominate in cathedral design. The cathedral at **Jaen,** by *Valdelvira* (1525), an imposing structure with three aisles and side chapels, was treated internally with the Corinthian order throughout. The Cathedral of **Granada** (1529, by *Diego de Siloë*) is especially interesting for its great domical sanctuary 70 feet in diameter, and for the largeness and dignity of its conception and details. The cathedral of Malaga, the church of San Domingo at Salamanca, and the monastery of San Girolamo in the same city are either wholly or in part Plateresque, and provided with portals of especial richness of decoration. Indeed, the portal of S. Domingo practically forms the whole façade.

In secular architecture the **Hospital** of **Santa Cruz** at Toledo, by *Enrique de Egaz* (1504–16), is one of the earliest examples of

the style. Here, as also in the **University** at **Salamanca** (Fig. 202), the portal is the most notable feature, suggesting both Italian and French models in its details. The great **College** at **Alcalá de Henares** is another important early monument of the Renaissance (1500–17, by *Pedro Gumiel*). In most designs the preference was for long façades of moderate height, with a basement showing few openings, and a *bel étage* lighted by large windows widely spaced. Ornament was chiefly concentrated about the doors and windows, except for the roof balustrades, which were often exceedingly elaborate. Occasionally a decorative motive is spread over the whole façade, as in the **Casa de las Conchas** at Salamanca, adorned with cockle-shells carved at intervals all over the front—a bold and effective device; or the Infantada palace with its spangling of carved diamonds. The courtyard, or *patio*, was an indispensable feature of these buildings, as in all hot countries, and was surrounded by arcades frequently of the most fanciful design overloaded with minute ornament, as in the **Infantada** at Guadalajara, the **Casa de Zaporta,** formerly at Saragossa (now

FIG. 202.—DOOR OF THE UNIVERSITY, SALAMANCA.

removed to Paris; Fig. 203), and the Lupiana monastery. The patios in the **Archbishop's Palace** at Alcalá de Henares and the **Collegio de los Irlandeses** at Salamanca are of simpler design; that of the **Casa de Pilatos** at Séville is almost purely Moorish. Salamanca abounds in buildings of this period.

FIG. 203.—CASA DE ZAPORTA: COURTYARD.

THE GRIEGO-ROMANO. The more classic treatment of architectural designs by the use of the orders was introduced by *Alonzo Berruguete* (1480–1561), who studied in Italy after 1503. The Archbishop's Palace and the Doric **Gate** of **San Martino,** both at Toledo, were his work, as well as the first palace at Madrid. The Palladio of Spain was, however, by *Juan de Herrera,* the architect of **Valladolid Cathedral,** built under Philip V. This vast edifice follows the general lines of the earlier cathedrals of Jaen and Granada, but in a style of classical correctness almost severe in aspect, but well suited to the grand scale of the church. The masterpiece of this period was the monastery of the **Escurial,** begun by *Juan Battista* of Toledo, in 1563, but not completed until nearly one hundred and fifty years later. Its final architec-

tural aspect was largely due to Herrera. It is a vast rectangle of 740 × 580 feet, comprising a complex of courts, halls, and cells, dominated by the huge mass of the chapel. This last is an imposing domical church covering 70,000 square feet, treated throughout with the Doric order, and showing externally a lofty dome and campaniles with domical lanterns, which serve to diversify the otherwise monotonous mass of the monastery. What the Escurial lacks in grace or splendor is at least in a measure redeemed by its majestic scale and varied sky-lines. The **Palace of Charles V.** (Fig. 204), adjoining the Alhambra at Granada, though begun as early as 1527 by *Machuca*, was mainly due to Berruguete, and is an excellent example of the Spanish Palladian style. With its circular court, admirable proportions and well-studied details, this often maligned edifice deserves to be ranked among the most successful examples of the style. During this period the cathedral of Seville received many alterations, and the upper part of the adjoining Moorish tower of the **Giralda**, burned in 1395, was rebuilt by *Fernando Ruiz* in the prevalent style, and with considerable elegance and appropriateness of design.

FIG. 204.—PALACE OF CHARLES V., GRANADA.

Of the **Palace** at **Madrid**, rebuilt by Philip V. after the burning of the earlier palace in 1734, and mainly the work of an

Italian, *Ivara:* the Aranjuez palace (1739, by *Francisco Herrera*), and the Palace at **San Ildefonso,** it need only be said that their chief merit lies in their size and the absence of those glaring violations of good taste which generally characterized the successors of Churriguera. In ecclesiastical design these violations of taste were particularly abundant and excessive, especially in the façades and in the sanctuary—huge aggregations of misplaced and vulgar detail, with hardly an unbroken pediment, column, or arch in the whole, yet sometimes, in spite of their extravagance, undeniably picturesque. Some extreme examples of this style are to be found in the Spanish-American churches of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as at Chihuahua and many other cities in Mexico, at Tucson (Arizona), and other places. The least offensive features of the churches of this period were the towers, usually in pairs at the west end, some of them showing excellent proportions and good composition in spite of their execrable details.

Minor architectural works, such as the rood screens in the churches of Astorga and Medina de Rio Seco, and many tombs at Granada, Avila, Alcala, etc., give evidence of superior skill in decorative design, where constructive considerations did not limit the exercise of the imagination.

PORTUGAL. The Renaissance appears to have produced few notable works in Portugal. Among the chief of these are the **Tower,** the church, and the **Cloister** at Belem. These display a riotous profusion of minute carved ornament, with a free commingling of late Gothic details, wearisome in the end in spite of the beauty of its execution (1500–40?). The church of **Santa Cruz** at Coimbra, and that of **Luz,** near Lisbon, are among the most noted of the religious monuments of the Renaissance, while in secular architecture the royal palace at **Mafra** is worthy of mention beside the Escurial of Madrid, which it rivals in size and architectural dignity. It is the work of *F. Ludwig*, a German architect (1717–1730).

MONUMENTS: (Mainly supplementary to preceding text.) Austria, Bohemia, etc.; At Prague, Schloss Stern, 1459-1565; Schwarzenburg Palace, 1544; Waldstein Palace, 1629; Salvator Chapel, Vienna, 1515; Schloss Shalaburg, near Mölk, 1530-1601; Ständehaus, Gratz, 1625. At Vienna: Imperial palace, various dates; Schwarzenburg and Lichtenstein palaces, 18th century.

Germany and Switzerland, First Period: Schloss Baden, 1510-20, and part 1569-82; Schloss Merseburg, 1514, with late 16th-century portals; Fuggerhaus at Augsburg, 1516; castles of Neuenstein, 1530-64; Celle, 1532-46 (and enlarged, 1665-70); Dessau, 1533; Leignitz, portal, 1533; Landshut, Neue Residenz, 1536-43; Plagnitz, 1550; Schloss Gottesau, 1553-88; castle of Güstrow, 1555-65; Lucerne, Rittersche Palast or "Schlössli," 1557; of Oels, 1559-1616; of Bernburg, 1565; of Heiligenburg, 1569-87; Münzhof at Munich, 1575; Lusthaus (demolished) at Stuttgart, 1575; Landshut, Schloss Trausnitz, 1578-80; Wilhelmsburg Castle at Schmalkald, 1584-90; castle of Hämelschenburg, 1588-1612.—Second Period: Zunfthaus at Basle, 1578, in advanced style; so also Juleum at Helmstädt, 1593-1612; gymnasium at Brunswick, 1592-1613; Spiesshof at Basle, 1600; castle at Berlin, 1600-1616, demolished in great part; castle Bevern, 1603; Schloss Bückeburg and church, early 17th century; Dantzic, Zeughaus, 1605; Wallfahrtskirche at Dettelbach, 1613; castle Aschaffenburg, 1605-13; Pal. in Greater Garden, Dresden, 1679; Schloss Weikersheim, 1600-83; Schloss Heiligenburg.—Third Period: Zeughaus at Berlin, 1695; palaces by Schlüter at Charlottenburg, and at Berlin, 1696-1706; Catholic church, Dresden, 1738, by Chiaveri; Bruchsal, Ducal Palace, 1720-42; Munich, Amalienburg, 1734, by de Cuvillié; Asamhouse, 1740; Potsdam, Stadt Schloss, 1740, by Knobelsdorf; Sans Souci, 1751-1768; other palace buildings 1754-1775; Berlin, Royal Library, 1775; the Neue Kirche, 1780. (For Classic Revival, see next chapter.)—Town Halls: At Heilbronn, 1535, Görlitz, 1537; Posen, 1550; Mülhausen, 1552; Cologne, porch with Corinthian columns and Gothic arches, 1569; Lübeck (Rathhaushalle), 1570; Schweinfurt, 1570; Gotha, 1574; Emden, 1574-76; Lemgo, 1589; Neisse, 1604; Nordhausen, 1610; Paderborn, 1612-16; Augsburg, 1615-1620, by Holl; Gernsbach, 1617; Magdeburg, 1691.

Spain and Portugal, 16th Century: Monastery San Marcos at Leon; palace of the Infanta, Saragossa; Carcel del Corte at Baez; Early Renaissance details in cloisters of Belem; choir of Cath. of

Thomar, Portugal, 1509; pulpit in Sta. Cruz, Coimbra, Portugal, 1522; Cath. of Malaga, W. front, 1538, by de Siloë; N. S. da Serra do Pilar, Gaya, Portugal, 1540-1600; Tavera Hospital, Toledo, 1541, by de Bustamente; Alcazar at Toledo, 1548; Lonja (Town Hall) at Saragossa, 1551; Evora, Portugal, University, 1551-58; cloister Dos Filippes, Thomar, 1557-62; Casa de la Sal, Casa Monterey, and Collegio de los Irlandeses, all at Salamanca; Town Hall, Casa de los Taveras and upper part of Giralda, all at Seville; Cath. Sé Nova at Coimbra, 1580; Sâo Vicente, Lisbon, 1570-1600.—17TH CENTURY: Circular cloister N. S. do Pilar, Oporto, 1602; Cathedral del Pilar, Saragossa, 1677; Tower del Seo, 1685.—18TH CENTURY; Palace and church at Mafra, 1717-30; palace at Madrid, 1735; at Aranjuez, 1739; cathedral of Santiago, 1738; Lonja at Barcelona, 1772.

CHAPTER XXV.

THE CLASSIC REVIVALS IN EUROPE.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: As before, Fergusson. Also Château, *Histoire et caractères de l'architecture en France;* and Lübke, *Geschichte der Architektur.* (For the most part, however, recourse must be had to the general histories of architecture, and to monographs on special cities or buildings.)

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By the end of the seventeenth century the Renaissance, properly speaking, had run its course in Europe. Having wearied in turn of the restraints of pure classicism and the extravagances of the Baroque, it had exhausted the springs of original invention. Taste rapidly declined before the growth of the industrial and commercial spirit in the eighteenth century. The ferment of democracy and the disquiet of far-reaching political changes had begun to preoccupy the minds of men to the detriment of all artistic creation, in the absence of which taste tended to swing back toward the safe standards of classic models. But the demand was for a literal copying of the arcades and porticos of Rome, to serve as frontispieces for buildings in which modern requirements should be accommodated to these antique exteriors, instead of controlling the design. The result was a manifest gain in the splendor of the streets and squares adorned by these highly decorative frontispieces, but at the expense of convenience and propriety in the buildings themselves. While this academic spirit too often sacrificed logic and originality to an arbitrary symmetry and to the supposed canons of Roman design, it also, on the other hand, led to a stateliness

and dignity in the planning, especially in the designing of vestibules, stairs, and halls, which render many of the public buildings it produced well worthy of study. The architecture of the Roman Revival was pompous and artificial, but seldom trivial, and its somewhat affected grandeur was a welcome relief from the dullness or extravagance of the styles it replaced.

THE GREEK REVIVAL. The Roman revival began, however, near the end of the eighteenth century, to be displaced in England and Germany by the Greek Revival, the result of a newly awakened interest in the long-neglected monuments of Attic art which the discoveries of Stuart and Revett—sent out in 1732 by the London Society of Dilettanti—had once more made known to the world. It led to a veritable *furore* in England for Greek Doric and Ionic columns, which were applied indiscriminately to every class of buildings, with utter disregard of propriety. The British taste was at this time at its lowest ebb, and failed to perceive the poverty of Greek architecture when deprived of its proper adornments or carving and sculpture, which were singularly lacking in the British examples. Nevertheless the Greek style in England had a long run of popular favor, yielding only toward the middle of the last century to the so-called Victorian Gothic, a revival of mediæval forms. In Germany the Greek Revival was characterized by a more cultivated taste and a more rational application of its forms, which were often freely modified to suit modern needs. In France, where the Roman Revival under Louis XV. had produced some notable results (see p. 330), and where the influence of the Royal School of Fine Arts (*École des Beaux-Arts*) tended to perpetuate the principles of Roman design, the Greek Revival found no footing. The Greek forms were seen to be too severe and intractable for present requirements. About 1830, however, a modified style of design, known since as the *Néo-Grec*, was introduced by the exertions of a small coterie of talented architects; and though its own life was short, it profoundly influenced French art in the direction of freedom

and refinement for a long time afterward. In Italy there was hardly anything in the nature of a true revival of either Roman or Greek forms. The few important works of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were conceived in the spirit of the late Renaissance, and took from the prevalent revival of classicism elsewhere merely a greater correctness of detail, not any radical change of form or spirit.

ENGLAND. In Great Britain the Palladian style of Wren



FIG. 205.—BRITISH MUSEUM, LONDON.

and Gibbs and their successors continued until superseded by the Greek revival, but not without a distinct tendency toward classic Roman types. The **Royal Exchange** (1789, restored 1846)—and the **Mansion House** (1739 by *Dance*) in London are examples of design in the Roman spirit; and public buildings in other cities, notably in Dublin and Bath, show the same tendency. Little by little Greek models began to supersede the Roman. The first fruit of the new movement seems to have been the **Bank of England** at London, by

Sir John Soane (1788). In this edifice the Greco-Roman order of the round temple at Tivoli was closely copied, and applied to a long façade, too low for its length and with no sufficient stylobate, but fairly effective with its recessed colonnade and unpierced walls. The **British Museum,** nearly sixty years later, by *Robert Smirke* (Fig. 205), was a more ambitious essay in a more purely Greek style. Its colossal Ionic colonnade was, however, a mere frontispiece, applied to a badly planned and commonplace building, from which it cut off needed light. The more modest but appropriate columnar façade to the **Fitzwilliam**

FIG. 206.—ST. GEORGE'S HALL, LIVERPOOL.

Museum at Cambridge, by *Basevi*, was a more successful attempt in the same direction, better proportioned and avoiding the incongruity of modern windows in several stories; but it is quite as Roman as it is Greek. Windows have always been the stumbling-block of the revived Greek style. The difficulties they raise are avoided, however, in buildings presenting but two stories, the order being applied to the upper story, upon a high stylobate serving as a basement. The **High School** and the Royal Institution at Edinburgh, by *Hamilton*, are for this reason, if for no other, superior to the British Museum and other many-storied Anglo-Greek edifices. In spite of all difficulties, however, the English extended the applications of the style with doubtful success not only to all manner of public buildings, but also to

country residences. Carlton House, Bowden Park, and Grange House are instances of this misapplication of Greek forms. Neither did it prove more tractable for ecclesiastical purposes. **St. Pancras's** Church at London, and several churches by *Thomson* (1817–75), in Glasgow, though interesting as experiments in such adaptation, are not to be commended for imitation. The most successful of all British Greek designs is **St. George's Hall** at Liverpool (Fig. 206) by *Elmes* (1809–1846) whose imposing peristyle and porches are sufficiently Greek in spirit and detail to class it among the works of the Greek Revival.* But its great hall and its interior composition are really Roman and not Greek, emphasizing the teaching of experience that Greek architecture does not lend itself to the exigencies of modern civilization to nearly the same extent as the Roman.

On the whole the most successful products of the Greek revival were minor works, especially sepulchral monuments. Among the best of these are two in Edinburgh, to the memory respectively of Robert Burns and Dugald Stewart, both inspired from the monument of Lysicrates (Fig. 38) though diverging widely from its detailed design.

GERMANY. During the eighteenth century the classic revival in Germany, which at first followed Roman precedents (as in the columns carved with spirally ascending reliefs in front of the church of **St. Charles Borromeo,** at Vienna, by *Fischer von Erlach*), was directed into the channel of Greek imitation by the literary works of Winckelmann, Lessing, Goethe, and others, as well as by the interest aroused by the discoveries of Stuart and Revett. The **Brandenburg Gate** at Berlin (1784 by *Schmidt*), was the earliest realization in architecture of this revived Hellenism, and one of its most successful applications to civic purposes. Without precisely copying any Greek structure, it was evidently inspired from the Athenian Propylæa, and nothing in its purpose

*The building was continued by *Rawlinson* and completed by *Cockerell* after Elmes' death.

is foreign to the style employed. The greatest activity in the style came later, however, and was greatly stimulated by the achievements of *Fr. Schinkel* (1781–1841), one of the greatest of modern German architects. While in the domical church of St. Nicholas at Potsdam he employed Roman forms in a modernized Roman conception, and followed in one or two other buildings the principles of the Renaissance, his predilections were for Greek architecture. His masterpiece was the **Museum** at Berlin, with an imposing portico of 18 Ionic columns (Fig. 207). This building with its fine rotunda was excellently planned, and forms, in conjunction with the **New Museum** by *Stühler* (1843–55), a noble palace of art, to whose monumental requirements and artistic purpose the Greek colonnades and pediments were not inappropriate. Schinkel's greatest successor was *Leo von Klenze* (1784–1864), whose more textual reproductions of Greek models won him great favor and wide employment.

FIG. 207.—THE OLD MUSEUM, BERLIN.

The **Walhalla** near Ratisbon is a modernized Parthenon, internally vaulted with glass; in spite of its elegance, but too obvious a plagiarism externally, and internally too un-Hellenic, to be greatly admired. The **Ruhmeshalle** at Munich, a double L partly enclosing a colossal statue of Bavaria, and devoted to the commemoration of Bavaria's great men, is copied from no Greek

building, though purely Greek in design and correct to the smallest detail. In the **Glyptothek** (Sculpture Gallery), in the same city, the one distinctively Greek feature introduced by Klenze, an Ionic portico, is also the one inappropriate note in the design. The **Propylæa** at Munich, by the same (Fig. 208), and the **Court Theatre** at Berlin, by Schinkel, are other important

FIG. 208.—THE PROPYLÆA, MUNICH.

examples of the style. Schinkel's genius was remarkably successful in adapting Greek details to the exigent difficulties of theatre design, and there is in the last-named edifice no suggestion of copying any known Greek building.

In Vienna the one notable monument of the Classic Revival is the **Reichsrathsgebäude** or Parliament House, by *Th. Hansen* (1843), an imposing two-storied composition with a lofty central colonnade and lower side-wings, harmonious in general proportions and pleasingly varied in outline and mass.

In general, the Greek Revival in Germany presents the aspect of a sincere striving after beauty, on the part of a limited number of artists of great talent, misled by the idea that the forms of a dead civilization could be galvanized into new life in the service

of modern needs. The result was disappointing, in spite of the excellent planning, admirable construction and carefully studied detail of these buildings, and the movement here as elsewhere was foredoomed to failure.

FRANCE. In France the Classic Revival, as we have seen, had made its appearance during the reign of Louis XV. in a number of important monuments which expressed the protest of their authors against the caprice of the Rococo style then in vogue. The colonnades of the Garde-Meuble, the façade of St. Sulpice, and the coldly beautiful Panthéon (Figs. 188, 190), testified to the conviction in the most cultured minds of the time that Roman grandeur was to be attained only by copying the forms of Roman architecture with the closest possible approach to correctness. The **Grand Théâtre,** at Bordeaux (1785, by *Victor Louis*), one of the largest and finest theatres in Europe, was another product of this movement, its stately colonnade forming one of the chief ornaments of the city. Under Louis XVI. there was a temporary reaction from this somewhat pompous affectation of antique grandeur; but there were few important buildings erected during that unhappy reign; the **Petit Trianon** by *Percier* and the Great Court of the Palais Royal by *V. Louis* are the most notable monuments of this reign. The reaction showed itself most effectively in a more delicate and graceful style of interior decoration. It was reserved for the Empire to set the seal of official approval on the Roman Revival. The Arch of Triumph of the Carrousel, behind the Tuileries, by *Percier and Fontaine*, the magnificent Arc de l'Étoile, at the summit of the Avenue of the Champs Élysées, by *Chalgrin;* the wing begun by Napoleon to connect the Tuileries with the Louvre on the land side, and the church of the Madeleine, by *Vignon*, erected as a temple to the heroes of the Grande Armée, were all designed, in accordance with the expressed will of the Emperor himself, in a style as Roman as the requirements of each case would permit. All these monuments, begun between 1806 and 1809, were completed

after the Restoration. The **Arch** of the **Carrousel** is a close copy of Roman models carried out with great elegance; that of the **Étoile** (Fig. 209) is a much more original design, of colossal dimensions. Its admirable proportions, simple composition and striking sculptures give it a place among the noblest creations of its class. The **Madeleine** (Fig. 210), externally a Roman Corinthian temple of the largest size, presents internally an almost Byzantine conception with the three pendentive domes that vault its vast nave, but all the details are Roman. However suitable for a pantheon or mausoleum, it seems strangely inappropriate as a design for a Christian church. To these monuments should be added the **Bourse** or Exchange, by *Brongniart*, heavy in spite of its Corinthian peristyle, and the river front of the **Corps Législatif,** added to the rear of the Palais Bourbon by *Poyet*, one of the very few extant examples of a dodecastyle portico with a pediment. All of these designs are characterized by great elegance of detail and excellence of execution, and however inappropriate in style to modern uses, they add immensely to the splendor of the French capital. Unquestionably no feature can take the place of a Greek or Roman

FIG. 209.—ARC DE L'ÉTOILE, PARIS.

colonnade as an embellishment for broad avenues and open squares, or as the termination of an architectural vista.

The Greek revival took little hold of the Parisian imagination. Its forms were too cold, too precise and fixed, too intractable to modern requirements to appeal to the French taste. It counts but one notable monument, the church of **St. Vincent de Paul,** by *Hittorff*, who sought to apply to this design the principles of

FIG. 210.—THE MADELEINE, PARIS.

Greek external polychromy; but the frescoes and ornaments failed to withstand the Parisian climate, and were finally erased. The Néo-Grec movement already referred to, initiated by Duc, Duban, and Labrouste about 1830, aimed only to introduce into modern design the spirit and refinement, the purity and delicacy of Greek art, not its forms (Fig. 211). Its chief monuments were the remodelling, by *Duc*, of the **Palais de Justice,** of which the new west façade and the hall behind it are the most striking features; the beautiful **Library of the École des Beaux-Arts,** by *Duban;* the Library of **Ste. Genéviève,** by *Labrouste*, in

which a long façade is treated without a pilaster or column, simple arches over a massive basement forming the dominant motive, while in the interior a system of iron construction with glazed domes controls the design; and the commemorative **Colonne Juillet,** by Duc, the most elegant and appropriate of all modern memorial columns. All these buildings, begun between 1830 and 1850 and completed at various dates, are distinguished by a remarkable purity and freedom of conception and detail, quite unfettered by the artificial trammels of the official academic style then prevalent.

FIG. 211.—DOORWAY, ÉCOLE DES BEAUX-ARTS, PARIS.

THE CLASSIC REVIVAL ELSEWHERE. The other countries of Europe have little to show in the way of imitations of classic monuments or reproductions of Roman colonnades. In Italy the church of **S. Francesco di Paola,** at Naples, in quasi imitation of the Pantheon at Rome, with wing-colonnades, and the **Superga,** at Turin (1706, by *Ivara*); the façade of the San Carlo Theatre, at Naples, and the Braccio Nuovo of the Vatican (1817, by *Stern*) are the monuments which come the nearest to the spirit and style of the Roman Revival. Yet in each of these

there is a large element of originality and freedom of treatment.

A reflection of the Munich school is seen in the modern public buildings of Athens, designed in some cases by German architects, and in others by native Greeks. The **University,** the Museum buildings, the **Academy of Art and Science,** and other edifices exemplify fairly successful efforts to adapt the severe details of classic Greek art to modern windowed structures. They suffer somewhat from the too liberal use of stucco in place of marble, and from the conscious affectation of an extinct style. But they are for the most part pleasing and monumental designs, appropriate to their surroundings, and adding greatly to the beauty of the modern city.

FIG. 212.—ST. ISAAC'S CATHEDRAL, ST. PETERSBURG.

In **RUSSIA**, during and after the reign of Peter the Great (1689–1725), there appeared a curious mixture of styles. A style analogous to the Jesuit in Italy and the Churrigueresque in Spain was generally prevalent, but it was in many cases modified by Muscovite traditions into nondescript forms like those of the later buildings of the **Kremlin,** at Moscow, or the less extravagant Citadel Church and Smolnoy Monastery at St. Petersburg. Along with this heavy and barbarous style, which prevails generally in the numerous palaces of the capital, finished in stucco with atrocious details, a more severe and classical spirit is met with. The church of the **Greek Rite** at St. Petersburg combines a Roman domical interior with an exterior of the Greek Doric

order. The Church of **Our Lady of Kazan** has a semicircular colonnade projecting from its transept, copying as nearly as may be the colonnades in front of St. Peter's. But the greatest classic monument in Russia is the **Cathedral of St. Isaac** (Fig. 212), at St. Petersburg, a vast rectangular edifice with four Roman Corinthian pedimental colonnades projecting from its faces, and a dome with a peristyle crowning the whole. Despite many defects of detail, and the use of cast iron for the dome, which pretends to be of marble, this is one of the most impressive churches of its size in Europe. Internally it displays the costliest materials in extraordinary profusion, while externally its noble colonnades go far to redeem its bare attic and the material of its dome. The **Palace of the Grand Duke Michael,** which reproduces, with improvements, Gabriel's colonnades of the Garde Meuble at Paris on its garden front, is a nobly planned and commendable design, agreeably contrasting with the debased architecture of many of the public buildings of the city. The Admiralty with its Doric pilasters, and the **New Museum,** by von Klenze of Munich, in a skilfully modified Greek style, with effective loggias, are the only other monuments of the classic revival in Russia which can find mention in a brief sketch like this. Both are notable and in many respects admirable buildings, in part redeeming the vulgarity which is unfortunately so prevalent in the architecture of St. Petersburg.

MONUMENTS: The principal monuments of the Classic Revival have been referred to in the foregoing text, but the following, among others, are worthy of mention: Custom House, London, by *Laing,* 1813-17; Colleges of Physicians and of Surgeons, London, by *Smirke* and *Barry,* 1825-35; University College, London, by *Wilkins;* Villa Greenough, Regent's Park, London; Library and Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool; Public Library, Manchester; Potsdamer Thor, Berlin, by *Schmidt;* Berlin Opera House, 1844, by *Langhaus;* Old Public Library, Berlin.

CHAPTER XXVI.

RECENT ARCHITECTURE IN EUROPE.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: As before, Château, Fergusson. Also Barqui, *L'Architecture moderne en France.—Berlin und seine Bauten* (and a series of similar works on the modern buildings of other German cities). Boileau, *Les préludes de l'architecture du XXe siècle.* Chabat, *La brique et la terre cuite.* Daly, *Architecture privée du XIXe siècle.* Garnier, *Le nouvel Opéra.* Gourlier, *Choix d'édifices publics.* Jackson, *Modern Gothic Architecture.* Jaffé, *Neubauten in Grossbritanien.* Lambert und Stahl, *Moderne Architektur.* Licht, *Architektur Deutschlands; Architektur der Gegenwart.* Lübke, *Denkmäler der Kunst.* Lützow und Tischler, *Wiener Neubauten.* Muthesius, *Die Neuere Kirchliche Kunst in England.* Narjoux, *Monuments élevés par la ville de Paris*, 1850–1880. Rückwardt, *Façaden und Details moderner Bauten.—Sammelmappe hervorragenden Concurrenz-Entwürfen.* Sédille, *L'Architecture moderne.* Selfridge, *Modern French Architecture.* Statham, *Modern Architecture.* Villars, *England, Scotland, and Ireland* (tr. Henry Frith). Consult also *Transactions of the Royal Institute of British Architects*, and the leading architectural journals of recent years.

MODERN CONDITIONS. The nineteenth century was preeminently an age of industrial progress. Its most striking advances were along mechanical, scientific, and commercial lines. As a result of this material progress the general conditions of mankind in civilized countries have undoubtedly been greatly bettered. Popular education and the printing-press have also raised the intellectual level of society, making learning the privilege of even the poorest. Intellectual, scientific, and commercial pursuits have thus largely absorbed those energies which in other ages found exercise in the creation of artistic forms and

objects. The critical and sceptical spirit, the spirit of utilitarianism and realism, has tended to check the free and general development of the creative imagination, at least in the plastic arts. While in poetry and music there have been great and noble achievements, the plastic arts, including architecture, have only of late years attained a position at all worthy of the intellectual advancement of the times.

Nevertheless the artistic spirit has never been wholly crushed out by the untoward pressure of realism and commercialism. Unfortunately it has repeatedly been directed in wrong channels. Modern archæology and the publication of the forms of historic art by books and photographs have too exclusively fastened attention upon the details of extinct styles as a source of inspiration in design. The whole range of historic art is brought within our survey, and while this has on the one hand tended toward the confusion and multiplication of styles in modern work, it has on the other sometimes led to a slavish adherence to historic precedent or a literal copying of historic forms. Modern architecture has thus oscillated between the extremes of archæological servitude and of an unreasoning eclecticism. In the hands of men of inferior training the results have been deplorable travesties of all styles, or meaningless aggregations of ill-assorted forms.

An important factor in this demoralization of architectural design has been the development of new constructive methods, especially in the use of iron and steel. It has been impossible for modern designers, in their treatment of style, to keep pace with the rapid changes in the structural use of metal in architecture. The roofs of vast span, largely composed of glass, which modern methods of trussing have made possible for railway stations, armories, and exhibition buildings; the immense unencumbered spaces which may be covered by them; the introduction and development, especially in the United States, of the post-and-girder system of construction for high buildings in which the external

walls are a mere screen or filling-in; these have revolutionized architecture so rapidly and completely that architects are still struggling and groping to find the solution of many of the problems of style, scale, and composition which they have brought forward.

Within the last forty years, however, architecture has, despite these new conditions, made notable advances. The artistic emulation of repeated international exhibitions, the multiplication of museums and schools of art, the general advance in intelligence and enlightenment, have all contributed to this artistic progress. There appears to be more of the artistic and intellectual quality in the average architecture of the present time, on both sides of the Atlantic, than ever before since the beginning of the nineteenth century. The futility of the archæological revival of extinct styles is generally recognized. New conditions are gradually procuring the solution of the very problems they raise. Historic precedent sits more lightly on the architect than formerly, and the essential unity of principle underlying all good design is coming to be better understood.

FRANCE. It is in France, Germany (including Austria), and England that the architectural progress of this period in Europe has been most marked. We have already noticed the results of the classic revivals in these three countries. Speaking broadly, it may be said that in France the influence of the *École des Beaux-Arts*, while it has tended to give greater unity and consistency to the national architecture, and has exerted a powerful influence in behalf of refinement of taste and correctness of style, has also stood in the way of a free development of new ideas. French architecture has generally until recent years adhered to the principles of the Renaissance, though the style has been modified by various influences. The first of these was the Néo-Grec movement, alluded to in the last chapter, which broke the grip of Roman tradition in matters of detail and gave greater elasticity to the national style. Next should be mentioned the Gothic

movement represented by Viollet-le-Duc, Lassus, Ballu, and their followers. Beginning about 1845, it produced comparatively few notable buildings, but gave a great impulse to the study of mediæval archæology and the restoration of mediæval monuments. The churches of Ste. Clothilde and of St. Jean de Belleville, at Paris, and the reconstruction of the Château de Pierrefonds, were among its direct results. Indirectly it led to a freer and more rational treatment of constructive forms and materials than had prevailed with the academic designers. The



FIG. 213.—PLAN OF LOUVRE AND TUILERIES, PARIS.
A, A, the Old Louvre, so called; B, B, the New Louvre.

church of **St. Augustin,** by *Baltard*, at Paris, illustrates this in its use of iron and brick for the dome and vaulting, and the **Collège Chaptal,** by *E. Train*, in its decorative treatment of brick and tile externally. The general adoption of iron for roof-trusses and for the construction of markets and similar buildings tended further in the same direction, the **Halles Centrales** at Paris, by *Baltard* (1846), being a notable example. The French have ever since this early masterpiece of ferric architecture led the world in the artistic handling of construction in metal.

THE SECOND EMPIRE. The reign of Napoleon III. (1852–70) was a period of exceptional activity, especially in Paris. The greatest monument of his reign was the completion of the **Louvre**

and **Tuileries,** under *Visconti* and *Lefuel*, including the remodelling of the pavilions de Flore and de Marsan. The new portions constitute the most notable example of modern French architecture, and the manner in which the two palaces were united deserves high praise. In spite of certain defects, this work is marked by a combination of dignity, richness, and refinement such as is rarely found in palace architecture (Figs. 213, 214). The **New Opera** (1863–75), by *Garnier* (d. 1898), stands next to the Louvre in importance as a national monument. It is by far the most sumptuous building for amusement in existence, but in purity of detail and in the balance and restraint of its design it is inferior to the work of Visconti and Lefuel (Fig. 215). To this reign belong the Palais de l'Industrie, by *Viel*, built for the exhibition of 1855, but demolished for that of 1900, and several great railway stations (Gare du Nord, by *Hittorff*, Gare de l'Est, Gare d'Orléans, etc.), in which the modern French version of the Renaissance was applied with considerable skill to buildings largely constructed of iron and glass. Town halls and theatres were erected in great numbers, and in decorative works like fountains and monuments the French were particularly successful. The fountains of **St. Michel,** Cuvier and Molière, at



FIG. 214.—PAVILION OF RICHELIEU, LOUVRE.

Paris, and of **Longchamps,** at Marseilles (Fig. 216), illustrate the fertility of resource and elegance of detailed treatment of the French in this department. Mention should also here be made of the extensive enterprises carried out by or under Napoleon III., in rectifying and embellishing the street-plans of Paris and other cities by new avenues and squares on a vast scale, adding greatly to the monumental splendor of these cities.

FIG. 215.—GRAND STAIRCASE OF THE OPÉRA, PARIS.

THE REPUBLIC. Since the disasters of 1870 a number of important structures have been erected, and French architecture has shown a remarkable vitality and flexibility under new conditions. Its productions have in general until recent years been marked by a refined taste and a conspicuous absence of eccentricity and excess; but it has for the most part trodden in well-worn paths. Among notable recent monuments are, in church architecture, the **Sacré-Cœur,** at Montmartre, by *Abadie*, a votive church inspired from the Franco-Byzantine style of Aquitania; in civil architecture the new **Hôtel de Ville,** at Paris, by *Ballu* and *Déperthes*, recalling the original structure destroyed by the Commune, but in reality an original creation

of great merit; in scholastic architecture the new École de Médecine, and the new **Sorbonne,** by *Sacconi;* and in other branches of the art the metal-and-glass exhibition buildings of 1878, 1889, and 1900. In the last of these the striving for originality and the effort to discard traditional forms reached the extreme, although accompanied by much very clever detail and a masterly

FIG. 216.—FOUNTAIN OF LONGCHAMPS, MARSEILLES.

use of color-decoration. To these should be added many noteworthy theatres, town-halls, court-houses, and *préfectures* in provincial cities, and commemorative columns and monuments almost without number. In street architecture there is now much more variety and originality than formerly, especially in private houses, and the reaction against the orders and against traditional methods of design has of late been growing stronger. The chief excellence of modern French architecture lies in its

rational planning, monumental spirit, and refinement of detail (Fig. 217), and in the intimate association of decorative sculpture and painting with structural design.

GERMANY AND AUSTRIA. German architecture has been more affected during the past fifty years by the archæological spirit than has the French. A pronounced mediæval revival partly accompanied, partly followed the Greek revival in Germany, and produced a number of churches and a few secular buildings in the basilican, Romanesque, and Gothic styles. These are less interesting than those in the Greek style, because mediæval forms are even more foreign to modern needs than the classic, being specially appropriate only to systems of design and construction which are no longer practicable. At Munich the Auekirche, by *Ohlmüller*, in an attenuated Gothic style; the Byzantine Ludwigskirche, and *Ziebland's* Basilica following Early Christian models; the Basilica by *Hübsch*, at Bulach, and the Votive Church at Vienna (1856) by *H. von Ferstel* (1828-1883) are notable neo-mediæval monuments. The last-named church may be classed with Ste. Clothilde at Paris (see p. 379), and St. Patrick's Cathedral at New York, all three being of approximately the same size and general style, recalling St. Ouen at Rouen. They are correct and elaborate, but more or less cold and artificial.

FIG. 217.—MUSÉE GALLIÉRA, PARIS.

More successful are many of the German theatres and concert halls, in which Renaissance and classic forms have been freely used. In several of these the attempt has been made to express by the external form the curvilinear plan of the auditorium, as in

the **Dresden Theatre,** by *Semper* (1841; Fig. 218), the theatre at Carlsruhe, by Hübsch, and the double winter-summer **Victoria Theatre,** at Berlin, by *Titz.* But the practical and æsthetic difficulties involved in this treatment have caused its general abandonment. The **Opera Houśe** at Vienna, by *Siccardsburg*

FIG. 218.—THEATRE AT DRESDEN.

and *Von der Nüll* (1861–69), is rectangular in its masses, and but for a certain triviality of detail would rank among the most successful buildings of its kind. The new **Burgtheater** in the same city is a more elaborately ornate structure in Renaissance style, somewhat florid and overdone.

Modern German architecture is at its best in academic and residential buildings. The **Industrial Museum,** at Berlin, by Schinkel, in which brick is used in a rational and dignified design without the orders; the Polytechnic School, at Zürich, by Semper; university buildings, and especially buildings for technical instruction, at Carlsruhe, Stuttgart, Strasburg, Dresden, Leipzig Vienna, and other cities, show a monumental treatment of the exterior and of the general distribution, combined with a careful study of practical requirements. In administrative build-

ings the Germans have hardly been as successful; and the new **Parliament House,** at Berlin, by *P. Wallot,* in spite of its splendor and costliness, is heavy and unsatisfactory in detail. The larger cities, especially Berlin, contain many excellent examples of house architecture, mostly in the Renaissance style, sufficiently monumental in design, though usually, like most German work, inclined to heaviness of detail. The too free use of stucco in imitation of stone is also open to criticism.

VIENNA. During the last forty years Vienna has undergone a transformation which has made it the rival of Paris as a stately

FIG. 219.—BLOCK OF DWELLINGS (MARIE-THERESIENHOF), VIENNA.

capital. The remodelling of the central portion, the creation of a series of magnificent boulevards and squares, and the grouping of the chief state and municipal buildings about these upon a monumental scheme of arrangement, have given the city an unusual aspect of splendor. Among the most important monu-

ments in this group are the **Parliament House,** by Hansen (see p. 369), and the **Town Hall,** by *F. Schmidt.* This latter is a Neo-Gothic edifice of great size and pretentiousness, but strangely thin and meagre in detail, and quite out of harmony with its surroundings. The university and museums are massive piles in Renaissance style; and it is the Renaissance rather than the classic or Gothic revival which prevails throughout the new city. The great blocks of residences and apartments (Fig. 219), which line its streets are highly ornate in their architecture, but for the most part done in stucco, which fails after all to give the aspect of solidity and durability which it seeks to counterfeit.

The city of **Buda-Pesth** has also in recent years undergone a phenomenal transformation of a similar nature to that effected in Vienna, but it possesses fewer monuments of conspicuous architectural interest. The **Synagogue** is a rich and pleasing edifice of brick in a modified Hispano-Moresque style. The most notable monument of the city, and one of the most imposing of modern legislative buildings in Europe, is the neo-Gothic **Parliament House** by *Steindl*, which, by its more massive design, offers a somewhat striking contrast to the Vienna Town Hall mentioned above.

GREAT BRITAIN. While the Anglo-Greek style was still in process of development, a coterie of enthusiastic students of British mediæval monuments—archæologists rather than architects—initiated a movement for the revival of the national Gothic architecture.* The first fruits of this movement, led by the two Pugins, Brandon, Rickman, and others (about 1830–40) were seen in countless pseudo-Gothic structures in which the pointed arches, buttresses, and clustered shafts of mediæval architecture were

* There had, indeed, been an earlier effort to revive the Gothic style in the famous Strawberry Hill mansion of Walpole in the later years of the 18th century, and again in Beckham's unlucky experiment of "Fonthill Abbey"; but these were individual and abortive efforts.

imitated or parodied according to the designer's ability, with frequent misapprehension of their proper use or significance. This unintelligent misapplication of Gothic forms was, however, confined to the earlier stages of the movement. With increasing light and experience came a more correct and consistent use of the mediæval styles, dominated by a spirit of archæological cor-

FIG. 220.—HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT, WESTMINSTER, LONDON.

rectness. This spirit, stimulated by extensive enterprises in the restoration of the great mediæval monuments of the United Kingdom, was fatal to any free and original development of the style along new lines. But it rescued church architecture from the utter meanness and debasement into which it had fallen and established a standard of taste which reacted on all other branches of design.

THE VICTORIAN GOTHIC. Between 1850 and 1870 the

striving after archæological correctness gave place to the more rational effort to adapt Gothic principles to modern requirements, instead of merely copying extinct styles. This effort, prosecuted by a number of architects of great intelligence, culture, and earnestness (Sir Gilbert Scott, George Edmund Street, Alfred Waterhouse, William Burges, and others), resulted in a number of extremely interesting buildings. Chief among these in size and cost stand the **Parliament Houses** at Westminster, begun in 1839 by *Sir Charles Barry* (1789–1850), in the Perpendicular style. This immense structure (Fig. 220), imposing in its simple masses and refined in its carefully studied detail, is the most successful monument of the Victorian Gothic style. It suffers, however, from a somewhat confused plan, and from the over-minuteness of its decorative detail. It cannot, on the whole, be claimed as a successful vindication of the claims of the promoters of the style as to the adaptability of Gothic forms to structures planned and built after the modern fashion. The **Assize Courts** at Manchester (Fig. 221), the **New Museum** at Oxford, the gorgeous **Albert Memorial,** at Lon

FIG. 221.—ASSIZE COURTS, MANCHESTER. DETAIL.

don, by *Scott*, and the **New Law Courts** at London, by *Street*, are all conspicuous illustrations of the same truth. They are conscientious, carefully studied designs in good taste, and yet generally unsuited in style to their purpose. They are like labored and scholarly verse in a foreign tongue, correct in form and language, but lacking the naturalness and charm of true and unfettered inspiration. A later essay of the same sort in a slightly different field is the **Natural History Museum** at South Kensington, by *Waterhouse* (1879), an imposing building in a modified Romanesque style (Fig. 222).

FIG. 222.—NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM, LONDON.

The church architecture which has been really the finest product of this movement since 1880 is, by contrast with these secular buildings, worthy of high praise. It is characterized by almost unfailing good taste, and by a dignity and simplicity of design and appropriateness of detail which can hardly be matched elsewhere in modern ecclesiastical work. The examples are too numerous to be individualized by special mention in so brief a notice.

OTHER WORKS. The Victorian Gothic style responded to

no deep and general movement of the popular taste, and, like the Anglo-Greek style, was doomed to failure from the inherent incongruity between modern needs and mediæval forms. Within the last twenty years there has been a quite general return to Renaissance principles, and the result is seen in a large number of town-halls, exchanges, museums, and colleges, in which Renaissance forms, with and without the orders, have been treated with increasing freedom and skilful adaptation to the materials and special requirements of each case. The Albert Memorial Hall (1863, by General Scott) may be taken as an early instance of this movement, and the **Imperial Institute** (Colonial offices), by Collcutt, the Oxford Town Hall and the new **S. Kensington Museum** by Sir Aston Webb, as among later examples. In domestic architecture the so-called Queen Anne style as practised by Norman Shaw, Ernest George, and others, was for a while in vogue, based on the brick architecture of Queen Anne's time, but freely and often artistically altered to meet modern tastes and needs. Many large mansions, as well as many schools and colleges, have been erected in a free version of the Tudor Gothic with distinct success. But it is in the smaller houses of villages and city suburbs that the English architects have in recent years shown the most distinctive talent, and nowhere, unless occasionally in the United States, are there to be seen such charming examples of simple, appropriate, unostentatious design as in these modest English houses of brick, timber and tile.

In its emancipation from the mistaken principles of archæological revivals, and in its evidences of improved taste and awakened originality, contemporary British architecture shows promise of good things to come. It is still inferior to the French in the monumental quality, in technical resource and refinement of decorative detail, but superior to it in picturesqueness and variety, especially of external mass and effect.

ELSEWHERE IN EUROPE. In other European countries recent architecture shows in general increasing freedom and

improved taste, but both its opportunities and its performance have been nowhere else as conspicuous as in France, Germany, and England. The costly Bourse and the vast but overloaded Palais de Justice at Brussels, by *Polaert*, are neither of them conspicuous for refined and cultivated taste. A few buildings of note in Switzerland, Russia, and Greece might find mention in a more extended review of architecture, but cannot here even be enumerated. In Italy, especially at Rome, Milan, Naples, and Turin, there has been a great activity in building since 1870, but with the exception of the **Monument to Victor Emmanuel** and the National Museum at Rome, monumental arcades and passages at Milan and Naples, and *Campi Santi* or monumental cemeteries at Bologna, Genoa, and one or two other places, there has been comparatively little of real importance built in Italy of late years.

L'ART NOUVEAU.—Since 1896, and particularly since the Paris Exposition of 1900, a movement has manifested itself in France and Belgium, and spread to Germany and Austria and even measurably to England, looking toward a more personal and original style of decorative and architectural design, in which the traditions and historic styles of the past shall be ignored. This movement has received from its adherents and the public the name of "L'Art Nouveau," or, according to some, "L'Art Moderne"; but, except in the minor arts, it can hardly be held to have created a really new style or to express any really new principle in art. It is mainly a reaction against a too slavish adherence to traditional forms and methods of design (see pp. 364, 390), a striving to ignore or forget the past rather than a reaching out after any well-understood, positive end; as such, it possesses the negative strength of protest rather than the affirmative strength of a vital principle. Its lack of cohesion is seen in the division of its adherents into groups, some looking to nature for inspiration, while others decry this as a mistaken quest; some seeking to emphasize structural lines, and others to ignore them altogether. All, however, are united in the avoidance of common-

place forms and historic styles, and this preoccupation has developed an amazing amount of originality and individualism of style, frequently reaching the extreme of eccentricity. The results have therefore been, as might be expected, extremely varied in merit, ranging from the most refined and reserved in style to the most harshly bizarre and extravagant. As a rule, they have been most successful in small objects—jewelry, silverware, vases and small furniture; and one most desirable feature of the movement has been the stimulus it has given (especially in France and England) to the organization and activity of "arts-and-crafts" societies, which occupy themselves with the encouragement of the decorative and industrial arts and the diffusion of an improved taste. In the field of the larger objects of design, in which the dominance of traditional form and of structural considerations is proportionally more imperious, the struggle to evade these restrictions becomes more difficult and results usually in more obvious and disagreeable eccentricities, which the greater size and permanence of the object tend further to exaggerate. The least successful achievements of the movement have accordingly been in architecture. The buildings designed by its most fervent disciples (*e.g.* the Pavillon Bleu at the Exposition of 1900, the Castel Béranger, Paris, by *H. Guimard*, the houses of the artist colony at Darmstadt by *J. M. Olbrich*, and others) are for the most part characterized by extreme stiffness, eccentricity, or ugliness. The requirements of construction and of human habitation cannot easily be met without sometimes using the forms which past experience has developed for the same ends; and the negation of precedent is not the surest path to beauty or even reasonableness of design. It is interesting to notice that in the intermediate field of furniture-design some of the best French productions recall the style of Louis XV., modified by Japanese ideas and spirit. This singular but not unpleasing combination is less surprising when we reflect that the style of Louis XV. was itself a protest against the formalism of the heavy classic architec-

ture of preceding reigns, and achieved its highest successes in the domain of furniture and interior decoration.

It may be fair to credit the new movement with one positive characteristic in its prevalent regard for line, especially for the effect of long and swaying lines, whether in the contours or ornamentation of an object. This is especially noticeable in the Belgian work, and in that of the Viennese "Secessionists," who have, however, carried eccentricity to a further point of extravagance than any others.

The search for novelty and the desire to dispense wholly with historic forms of design which are the chief marks of the Art Nouveau, were emphatically displayed in many of the remarkable buildings of the Paris **Exhibition of 1900,** in which a striking fertility and facility of design in the decorative details made more conspicuous the failure to improve upon the established precedents of architectural style in the matters of proportion, scale, general composition, and contour. As usual the metallic construction of these buildings was almost without exception admirable, and the decorative details, taken by themselves, extremely clever and often beautiful, but the combined result was not wholly satisfactory.

On the whole, although hardly constituting in itself a definite style, the movement seems likely to exert on European architecture an influence, direct and indirect, not unlike that of the Néo-Grec movement of 1830 in France (p. 372), but even more lasting and beneficial. It has already begun to break the hold of rigid classical tradition in design; and recent buildings, especially in Germany and Austria, like the works of the brilliant *Otto Wagner* in Vienna, show a pleasing freedom of personal touch without undue striving after eccentric novelty. Doubtless in French and other European architecture the same result will in time manifest itself.

In the United States the movement has not found a firm foothold because there has been no dominant, enslaving tradition to

protest against. The fundamental spirit of the movement may be recognized in the work of individual architects and decorative artists in the United States, executed years before the movement took recognizable form in Europe; and American decorative design has generally been, at least since 1880 or 1885, sufficiently free, individual and personal, to render unnecessary and impossible any concerted movement of artistic revolt against slavery to precedent.

CHAPTER XXVII.

ARCHITECTURE IN THE UNITED STATES.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: As before, Fergusson, Statham. Also, Baker, *American Country Homes and their Gardens.* Chandler, *The Colonial Architecture of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.* Cleaveland and Campbell, *American Landmarks.* Corner and Soderholz, *Colonial Architecture in New England.* Crane and Soderholz, *Examples of Colonial Architecture in Charleston and Savannah.* Desmond and Croly, *Stately Homes in America.* Dow, *The American Renaissance.* Drake, *Historic Fields and Mansions of Middlesex.* Everett, *Historic Churches of America; The Georgian ("Colonial") Period.** Little, *Early New England Interiors. Monographs of American Architecture.** Munn & Co., *American Homes and Gardens.* Schuyler, *American Architecture.* Stevens and Cobb, *Examples of American Domestic Architecture.* Van Rensselaer, *H. H. Richardson and His Works.* Wallis, *Old Colonial Architecture and Furniture.*

GENERAL REMARKS. The colonial architecture of modern times presents a peculiar phenomenon The colonizing nation, carrying into its new *habitat* the tastes and practices of a long-established civilization, modifies these only with the utmost reluctance, under the absolute compulsion of new conditions. When the new home is virgin soil, destitute of cultivation, government, or civilized inhabitants, the accompaniments and activities of civilization introduced by the colonists manifest themselves at first in curious contrast to the primitive surroundings. The struggle between organized life and chaos, the laborious sub-

* Published by the *American Architect and Building News.*

jugation of nature to the requirements of our complex modern life, for a considerable period absorb the energies of the colonists. The amenities of culture, the higher intellectual life, the refinements of art can, during this period, receive little attention. Meanwhile a new national character is being formed; the people are undergoing the moral training upon which their subsequent achievements must depend. With the conquest of brute nature, however, and the gradual emergence of a more cultivated class, with the growth of commerce and wealth and the consequent increase of leisure, the humanities find more place in the colonial life. The fine arts appear in scattered centres determined by peculiarly favorable conditions. For a long time they retain the impress, and seek to reproduce the forms, of the art of the mother country. But new conditions impose a new development. Maturing commerce with other lands brings in foreign influences, to which the still unformed colonial art is peculiarly susceptible. Only with political and commercial independence, fully developed internal resources, and a high national culture do the arts finally attain, as it were, their majority, and enter upon a truly national growth.

These facts are abundantly illustrated by the architectural history of the United States. The only one among the British colonies to attain complete political independence, it is the only one among them whose architecture has as yet entered upon an independent course of development, and this only within a comparatively recent period. Nor has even this development produced as yet a wholly independent national style. It has, however, originated new constructive methods, new types of buildings, and a distinctively American treatment of the composition and the masses in many classes of buildings, the decorative details being still, for the most part, derived from historic precedents. The architecture of the other British colonies has retained more of the provincial character, though producing from time to time individual works of merit. In South America and Mexico the

only buildings of importance are Spanish, French, or German in style, according to the nationality or training of the architects employed. The following sketch of American architecture refers, therefore, exclusively to its development in the United States.

FORMATIVE PERIOD. Buildings in stone were not undertaken by the early English colonists. The more important structures in the Southern and Dutch colonies were of brick imported from Europe. Wood was, however, the material most commonly employed, especially in New England, and its use determined in large measure the form and style of the colonial architecture. There was little or no striving for architectural elegance until the eighteenth century, when Wren's influence asserted itself in a modest way in the Middle and Southern colonies. The very simple and unpretentious town-hall at Williamsburg, Va., and St. Michael's, Charleston, are attributed to him; but the most that can be said for these, as for the brick churches and manors of Virginia previous to 1725, is that they are simple in design and pleasing in proportion, without special architectural elegance. The same is true of the wooden houses and churches of New England of the period, except that they are even simpler in design.

From 1725 to 1775 increased population and wealth along the coast brought about a great advance in architecture, especially in churches and in the dwellings of the wealthy. During this period, sometimes called the Georgian, was developed the *Colonial style*, based on that of the reigns of Anne and the first two Georges in England, and in church architecture on the models set by Wren and Gibbs. All the details were, however, freely modified by the general employment of wood. The scarcity of architects trained in Old World traditions contributed to this departure from classic precision of form. The style, especially in interior design, reflected the cultured taste of the colonial aristocracy in its refined treatment of the woodwork, much of which appears to have been imported from England. But there

was little or no architecture of a truly monumental character. Edifices of stone were singularly few, and administrative buildings were small and modest, owing to insufficient grants from the Crown, as well as to the poverty of the colonies.

The churches of this period include a number of interesting designs, especially pleasing in the forms of their steeples. The **"Old South"** at Boston (now a museum), Trinity at Newport, and **St. Paul's** at New York—one of the few built of stone (1764)—are good examples of the style. **Christ Church** at Philadelphia (1727–35, by Dr. Kearsley) is another example, historically as well as architecturally interesting (Fig. 223); and there are scores of other churches almost equally noteworthy, scattered through New England, Maryland, Virginia, and the Middle States.

FIG. 223.—CHRIST CHURCH, PHILADELPHIA.

DWELLINGS. These reflect better than the churches the varying tastes of the different colonies. Maryland and Virginia abound in fine brick manor-houses, set amid extensive grounds walled in and entered through iron gates of artistic design. The interior finish of these houses was often elaborate in conception and admirably executed. Westover (1737), Carter's Grove (1737) in Virginia, and the Harwood and Hammond Houses at Annapolis, Md. (1770), are examples. The majority of the New

England houses were of wood, more compact in plan, more varied and picturesque in design than those of the South, but wanting somewhat of their stateliness. The interior finish of wainscot, cornices, stairs, and mantelpieces shows, however, the same general style, in a skilful and artistic adaptation of classic forms to the slender proportions of wood construction. Externally the

FIG. 224.—CRAIGIE (LONGFELLOW) HOUSE, CAMBRIDGE.

orders appear in porches and in colossal pilasters, with well designed entablatures, and windows of Italian model. The influence of the Adam and Sheraton furniture is doubtless to be seen in these quaint and often charming versions of classic motives. The Hancock House, Boston (of stone, demolished); the Sherburne (or Warner) House, Portsmouth (1714); Craigie House, Cambridge (1757, Fig. 224); and Rumford House, North Woburn (Mass.), are typical examples. The roofs were generally either gambrelled or hipped; in the latter case the central portion was nearly flat and was balustraded. Many of the doorways show notable elegance and refinement of design.

In the Middle States architectural activity was chiefly centred in Philadelphia and New York, and one or two other towns, where a number of manor-houses, still extant, attest the wealth and taste of the time. It is noticeable that the veranda or piazza was confined to the Southern States, but that the climate seems to have had little influence on the forms of roofs, except that the gambrel roof is seldom seen south of Pennsylvania.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS. Of public and monumental architecture this period has little to show. Large cities did not exist; New York, Boston, and Philadelphia were hardly more than overgrown villages. The public buildings—court-houses and town-halls—were modest and inexpensive structures. The Old State House and Faneuil Hall at Boston, the Town Hall at Newport, (R. I.), and **Independence Hall** at Philadelphia, the best known of those now extant, are not striking architecturally. Monumental design was beyond the opportunities and means of the colonies. It was in their churches, all of moderate size, and in their dwellings that the colonial builders achieved their greatest successes; and these works are quaint, charming, and refined, rather than impressive or imposing.

To the latter part of the colonial period belong a number of interesting buildings which remain as monuments of Spanish rule in California, Florida, and the Southwest. The old Fort San Marco, now Fort Marion (1656-1756), and the Catholic cathedral (1793; after the fire of 1887 rebuilt in its original form with the original façade uninjured), both at St. Augustine, Fla.; the picturesque buildings of the California missions (mainly 1769-1800), the majority of them now in ruins; scattered Spanish churches in California, Arizona, and New Mexico, and a few unimportant secular buildings, display among their modern and American settings a picturesque and interesting Spanish aspect and character, though from the point of view of architectural detail they represent merely a chastened phase of the Churriguer-esque style.

EARLY REPUBLICAN PERIOD. Between the Revolution and the War of 1812, under the new conditions of independence and self-government, architecture took on a more monumental character. Buildings for the State and National administrations were erected with the rapidly increasing resources of the country. Stone was more generally used; colonnades, domes, and cupolas or bell-towers, were adopted as indispensable features of civic architecture. In church building the Wren-Gibbs

FIG. 225.—NATIONAL CAPITOL, WASHINGTON.

type continued to prevail, but with greater correctness of classic forms. A number of excellent examples of these churches, the work of the Connecticut architect *Ithiel Towne*, are to be seen in Hartford and New Haven, and other towns in the Connecticut valley. The gambrel roof tended to disappear from the houses of this period, and there was some decline in the refinement and delicacy of the details of architecture. The influence of the Louis XVI. style is traceable in many cases, as in the New York City Hall (1803–12, by *McComb* and *Mangin*), one of the very best designs of the time, and in the delicate stucco-work and interior finish of many houses. The original **Capitol** at Washington—

the central portion of the present edifice—by *Thornton*, *Hallet*, and *B. H. Latrobe* (1793–1830; Fig. 225), the **State House** at Boston (1795, by *Bulfinch*), and the University of Virginia, at Charlottesville, by *Thomas Jefferson* (1817; somewhat remodelled since a fire in 1895), are the most interesting examples of the classic tendencies of this period.

THE CLASSIC REVIVAL. The influence of the classic revivals of Europe began to appear before the close of this period, and reached its culmination about 1830-40. It left its impress most strongly on our Federal architecture and the governmental buildings of the States and cities, although it also invaded domestic architecture, producing countless imitations, in brick and wooden houses, of Grecian colonnades and porticos. One of its first-fruits was the White House, or Executive Mansion, at Washington, by *Hoban* (1792), recalling the large English country houses of the time. The Greek Revival, a reflection of the movement in England, began to displace the Roman types as early as about 1820, and thereafter continued for nearly 30 years to dominate the public architecture of the country. The **Treasury** and **Patent Office** buildings at Washington, the Phila-

FIG. 226.—THE OLD CUSTOM HOUSE, NEW YORK.*

* Remodelled for the National City Bank in 1908 by the addition of two stories in a superposed Corinthian order.

delphia Mint, the **Sub-treasury** and **Old Custom House** at New York (the latter erected originally for the Merchants' Exchange in 1841 by *I. Rogers*; Fig. 226), and the **Boston Custom House** are among the important Federal buildings of this period. Several State capitols were also erected under the same influence; and the Marine Exchange and **Girard College** at Philadelphia should also be mentioned as conspicuous examples of the pseudo-Greek style. The last named building is in form a Corinthian Greco-Roman temple, although too palpably an imitation imperfectly adapted to its modern functions, to be claimed as wholly successful. These classic buildings were solidly and carefully constructed, but lacked the freedom and appropriateness of earlier buildings and the sculpture demanded by their classic design. The Capitol at Washington was during this period greatly enlarged by terminal wings with fine Corinthian porticos, of Roman rather than Greek design. The **Dome,** by *Walter*, was not added until 1858–73; it is a successful and harmonious composition, nobly completing the building. Unfortunately, it is an afterthought, built of iron painted to simulate marble, the substructure being inadequate to support a dome of masonry. The Italian or Roman style which it exemplified, in time superseded the less tractable Greek style.

It is however worthy of remark that the Greek Revival produced on the whole more satisfactory results in the United States than either in England or Germany. The churches, town-halls, State capitols and custom houses erected during this period are marked by excellent proportions and quiet and refined detail; the windows are treated with frankness and yet with true appreciation of the spirit of Greek architecture; and even in the wooden houses the mouldings are well profiled and the details designed with excellent taste.

THE WAR PERIOD. The period from 1850 to 1876 was one of intense political activity and rapid industrial progress. The former culminated in the terrible upheaval of the civil war; the

latter in the completion of the Pacific Railroad (1869) and a remarkable development of the mining resources and manufactures of the country. It was a period of feverish commercial activity, but of artistic stagnation, and witnessed the erection of but few buildings of architectural importance. A number of State capitols, city halls and churches, of considerable size and cost but of inferior design, attest the decline of public taste and architectural skill during these years. The huge Municipal Building at Philadelphia and the Capitol at Albany are full of errors of planning and detail which twenty-five years of elaboration have failed to correct. Next to the dome of the Capitol at Washington, completed during this period, of which it is the most signal architectural achievement, its most notable monument was the **St. Patrick's Cathedral** at New York, by *Renwick;* a Gothic church which, if somewhat cold and mechanical in detail, is a stately and well-considered design. Its west front and spires (completed 1886) are particularly successful. Trinity Church (1843, by *R. Upjohn*) and Grace Church (1840, by Renwick), though of earlier date, should be classed with this cathedral as worthy examples of modern Gothic design. Indeed, the churches designed in this style by a few thoroughly trained architects during this period are the most creditable and worthy among its lesser productions. In general an undiscriminating eclecticism of style prevailed, unregulated by sober taste or technical training. The Federal buildings by *Mullett* were monuments of uninspired and mechanical design based on French Renaissance motives. The New York and Boston Post Offices and the State, Army and Navy Department building at Washington are examples of this style.

THE ARTISTIC AWAKENING. Between 1870 and 1880 a remarkable series of events exercised a powerful influence on the artistic life of the United States. Two terrible conflagrations, in Chicago (1871) and Boston (1872), gave unexampled opportunities for architectural improvement and greatly stimulated the public interest in the art. The feverish and abnormal industrial

activity which followed the war and the rapid growth of the parvenu spirit were checked by the disastrous "panic" of 1873. With the completion of the Pacific railways and the settlement of new communities in the West, industrial prosperity, when it returned, was established on a firmer basis. An extraordinary expansion of travel to Europe began to disseminate the seeds of artistic culture throughout the country. The successful establishment of schools of architecture in Boston (1866) and other cities, and the opening or enlargement of art museums in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Detroit, Milwaukee, and elsewhere, stimulated the artistic awakening which now manifested itself. In architecture the personal influence of two men, trained in the Paris École des Beaux-Arts, was especially felt—of *R. M. Hunt* (1827–95) through his words and deeds quite as much as through his works; and of *H. H. Richardson* (1828–86) predominantly through his works. These two men, with others of less fame but of high ideals and thorough culture, did much to elevate architecture as an art in the public esteem. Mention must also be made of the strong personal influence of *W. R. Ware*, through the training, in the two architectural schools of which he was the organizer in Boston and New York, of many gifted pupils who have since achieved high reputation in the profession. To all these influences new force was added by the Centennial Exhibition at Philadelphia (1876). Here for the first time the American people were brought into contact, in their own land, with the products of European and Oriental art. It was to them an artistic revelation, whose results were prompt and far-reaching. Beginning first in the domain of industrial and decorative art, its stimulating influence rapidly extended to painting and architecture, and with permanent consequences. American students began to throng the centres of Old World art, while the setting of higher standards of artistic excellence at home, and the development of important art-industries, were other fruits of this artistic awakening. The

Columbian Exhibition at Chicago in 1893, added a new impulse to the movement, especially in architecture.

STYLE IN RECENT ARCHITECTURE. The rapid increase in the number of American architects trained in Paris or under the indirect influence of the École des Beaux-Arts has been an impor-



FIG. 227.—TRINITY CHURCH, BOSTON.

tant factor in recent architectural progress. Yet it has by no means imposed the French academic formulæ upon American architecture. The conditions, materials, and constructive processes here prevailing, and above all the eclecticism of the public taste, have prevented this. The French influence is perceived rather in a growing appreciation of monumental design in the planning, composition, and setting of buildings, than in any direct imitation of French models. The Gothic revival which prevailed more or less widely from 1840 to 1875, as already noticed, and of which the **State Capitol** at Hartford (Conn.), by *R. M. Upjohn*,

and the **Fine Arts Museum** at Boston, were among the last important products, was generally confined to church architecture, for which Gothic forms are still largely employed, as in the Protestant **Cathedral** of **All Saints** now building at Albany, N. Y. (by *R. W. Gibson*). For the most part the works of the last twenty years show a more or less judicious eclecticism, the choice of style being determined partly by the person and training of the designer, partly by the nature of the building. The powerfully conceived works of Richardson, in a free version of the French Romanesque, for a time exercised a wide influence, especially among the younger architects. **Trinity Church,** Boston (Fig. 227), his earliest important work; many public libraries and business buildings, and finally the impressive **County Buildings** at Pittsburgh (Pa.), all treated in this style, are admirable rather for the strong individuality of their designer,



FIG. 228.—LIBRARY AT WOBURN, MASS.

displayed in their vigorous composition, than on account of the historic style he employed (Fig. 228). Flexible in his hands, it proved intractable in those of many of his imitators, and was so

often travestied by inferior designers that it lost its vogue within a few years after Richardson's death. The Chicago Columbian Exhibition in which various architects collaborated, using Renaissance motives, completed its extinction. Since 1893 the Renaissance styles have generally prevailed, though here also a wide eclecticism prevails as to the version or particular phase of these styles to be employed. Meanwhile there are many more or less successful ventures in other historic styles applied to public and private edifices. Underlying this apparent confusion in the use of historic styles, the careful observer may detect certain tendencies crystallizing into definite form. New materials and methods of construction, increased attention to detail, a growing sense of monumental requirements, even the development of the elevator as a substitute for the grand staircase, are leaving their mark on the planning, the proportions, and the artistic composition of American buildings, irrespective of the styles used. The art is with us in a state of transition, and open to criticism in many respects; but it appears to be full of life and promise for the future.

COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS. This class of edifices has in our great cities developed wholly new types, which have taken shape under four imperative influences. These are the demand for fire-proof construction, the demand for well-lighted offices, the introduction of elevators, and the concentration of business into limited areas, within which land has become inordinately costly. These causes have led to the erection of buildings of excessive height (Fig. 229); the more recent among them constructed with a framework of iron or steel columns and beams, the visible walls being a mere filling-in. To render a building of twenty stories attractive to the eye, especially when built on an irregular site, is a difficult problem, of which a wholly satisfactory solution has yet to be found. There have been, however, some notable achievements in this line, in most of which the principle has been clearly recognized that a lofty building should have a

well-marked basement or pedestal and a somewhat ornate crowning portion or capital, the intervening stories serving as a die or shaft and being treated with comparative simplicity. The difficulties of scale and of handling one hundred and fifty to three hundred windows of uniform style, have been surmounted with conspicuous skill (**West Street Building** [*Cass Gilbert*], American Surety Building [*Bruce Price*, 1847–1902], and Broadway Chambers, New York; Ames Building, Boston; Carnegie Building, Pittsburgh; Union Trust, St. Louis). In some cases, especially in Chicago and the Middle West, the metallic framework is suggested by slender piers between the windows, rising uninterrupted from the basement to the top story. In others, especially in New York and the East, the walls are treated as in ordinary masonry buildings. Since 1906 the tendency toward excessive height has in New York reached an extravagant extreme in the Singer Building, 625 feet high, and the Metropolitan Life Building, 700 feet high. These towers are out of scale with their own details and with surrounding buildings, and belong almost more in the domain of engineering than of architecture. In the details of American office-buildings every variety of style is to be met with; but the Romanesque and the Renaissance, freely modified, predominate. The tendency toward two or three well-marked types in the external composition of these buildings, as above suggested, indicates, however, the evolution of a style in which the historic origin of the details will be a secondary matter. Certain Chicago architects have developed an original treatment of architectural forms by ex-

FIG. 229.—"TIMES" BUILDING, NEW YORK.

aggerating some of the structural lines, by suppressing the mouldings and more familiar historic forms, and by the free use of flat surface ornament. The Schiller, Auditorium, and Fischer Buildings, all at Chicago, Guaranty Building, Buffalo, and Majestic Building, Detroit, all by *L. H. Sullivan*, are examples of this personal style, which illustrates the untrammelled freedom of the art in a land without traditions.

FIG. 230.—COUNTRY HOUSE AT NYACK, N. Y.

DOMESTIC ARCHITECTURE. It is in this field that the most characteristic and original phases of American architecture are to be met with, particularly in rural and suburban residences. In these the peculiar requirements of our varying climates and of American domestic life have been studied and in large measure met with great frankness and artistic appreciation. The broad staircase-hall, serving often as a sort of family sitting-room, the "piazza" or veranda, and a picturesque massing of steep roofs,

have been the controlling factors in the evolution of two or three general types which appear in infinite variations. The material most used is wood, but this has had less influence in the determination of form than might have been expected. In recent years, however, various forms of construction in tile and in concrete have begun to displace wood and shingle as a material for rural houses. The artlessness of the planning, which is arranged to afford the maximum of convenience rather than to conform to any traditional type, has been an element of great artistic success. It has resulted in exteriors which are the natural outgrowth of the interior arrangements, frankly expressed, without affectation of style (Fig. 230). The resulting picturesqueness has, however, in many cases been treated as an end instead of an incidental result, and the affectation of picturesqueness has in such designs become as detrimental as any affectation of style. In the internal treatment of American houses there has also been a notable artistic advance, harmony of color and domestic comfort and luxury being sought after rather than monumental effects. A number of large city and country houses designed on a palatial scale have, however, given opportunity for a more elaborate architecture; notably the Vanderbilt, Reid, Carnegie, Schwab, and Phipps residences at New York, the great country-seat of **Biltmore** near Asheville (N. C.), in the Francis I. style (by *R. M. Hunt*), and many others. Many of the more important among recent country houses follow Colonial models with marked success. The style lends itself to a certain dignity and elegance of treatment which are well suited to large residences, and which are further enhanced in many cases by grounds whose elaborate landscape gardening shows notable progress in an art that was long almost wholly neglected in this country.

OTHER BUILDINGS. American architects have generally been less successful in public, administrative, and ecclesiastical architecture than in commercial and domestic work. The pre-

ference for small parish churches, treated as audience-rooms rather than as places of worship, has interfered with the development of noble types of church-buildings. Yet there are signs of improvement; and many of the more recent churches, whether in Gothic style or in some form of the neo-classic, are marked by great dignity of effect and sound construction. In semi-public architecture, such as hotels, theatres, clubs, and libraries, there

FIG. 231.—COUNTRY HOUSE IN COLONIAL STYLE.
(From *The American Architect.*)

are many notable examples of successful design. The **Ponce de Leon Hotel** at St. Augustine, a sumptuous and imposing pile in a free version of the Spanish Plateresco (*Carrère and Hastings*); the Auditorium Theatre at Chicago, the Madison Square Garden and the Casino Theatre at New York, all erected 1880–90, marked each a notable advance in design over previous works of the same kind. The Century, Metropolitan and University Clubs at New York and the **Boston Public Library** (all by *McKim, Mead and White*), the Carnegie Library at Pittsburgh, the **Congressional Library** at Washington, the Minnesota

State Capitol at St. Paul (*Cass Gilbert*) and the new **New York Public Library** (*Carrère and Hastings*) exemplify in varying degrees of excellence the increasing capacity of American architects for monumental design. The beginnings of this new taste for monumental effects were shown in the buildings of the **Columbian Exposition** at Chicago in 1893. These, in spite of many faults of detail, constituted a scenic display of architectural splendor such as had never before been seen on this side the Atlantic. They further brought architecture into closer union with the allied arts and formed an object lesson in the value of appropriate landscape gardening as a setting to monumental structures.

RECENT AMERICAN ARCHITECTURE. The architectural activity of the United States since the new century opened has by no means been confined to industrial and commercial architecture. Indeed, while the erection of lofty office-buildings has continued in the great commercial centres, the most notable architectural enterprises of recent years have been in the field of educational buildings, in both the East and West. In 1898 a great international competition resulted in the selection of the design of Mr. *E. Bénard* of Paris for a magnificent group of buildings for the **University of California** on a scale of unexampled grandeur, and the erection of this colossal project has been begun. In New York the university groups of Columbia University and New York University, both by *McKim, Mead and White* in neo-classic style (notably the **Low Library** of Columbia University), and the striking neo-Gothic group of the **City College** by *G. B. Post*, have been carried far toward completion: an equally ambitious project, by *Cope and Stewardson*, has been adopted for the Washington University at St. Louis; and many other universities and colleges have either added extensively to their existing buildings or planned an entire rebuilding on new designs. Among these the national military and naval academies at **West Point** (*Cram, Goodhue and Ferguson*), and **Annapolis**

(*Ernest Flagg*), take the first rank in the extent and splendor of the projected improvements. Museums and libraries have also been erected or begun in various cities, and the New York Public Library, already mentioned, but still uncompleted, will rank in cost and beauty with those already erected in Boston and Washington.

In other departments mention should be made of recent Federal buildings (custom-houses, post-offices, and court-houses) erected under the provisions of the Tarsney act from designs secured by competition among the leading architects of the country; among these the **New York Custom House,** by *Cass Gilbert*, is the most important, but other buildings, at Washington, Indianapolis, Cleveland and elsewhere, are also conspicuous, and many of them worthy of high praise. The tendency to award the designing of important public buildings, such as State capitols, county court-houses, city halls, libraries, and hospitals, by competition instead of by personal and political favor, has resulted in a marked improvement in the quality of American public architecture.

MONUMENTS. (Ch. = church; Ho. = house).—I. COLONIAL: In NEW ENGLAND.—Cradock Ho., Medford, Mass., 1634; Witches' Ho., Salem, 1640; Old Stone Ho., Guilford, Conn., 1640; Warner Ho., Portsmouth, N. H., 1714; Pepperell Ho., Kittery, Me., 1725; Town House, Newport, R. I., by *Munday*, 1743; Hooper Ho., Danvers, Mass., 1744; Vassall-Craigie Ho., Cambridge, Mass., 1759; City Hall, Newport, R. I., 1760, by *P. Harrison;* Langdon, Wentworth and Pierce houses, Portsmouth, N. H.; Ladd Ho., Marblehead; Cowles Ho., Farmington, Conn., 1780; Count Rumford Ho., No. Woburn, Mass., 1790; Hollester Ho., Greenfield, Mass., 1797.—The "Old Ship" Church, Hingham, Mass., 1681; Old South Church, Boston, 1729; Farmington Ch., Conn., 1750; Old North Ch.; King's Chapel, Boston.—The Old State House, Boston, 1748?; Faneuil Hall, Boston, by *P. Smibert*, 1763; City Hall (Old State House), Hartford, Conn., 1812, by *Bulfinch*.—In MIDDLE STATES:—Phillipse Manor, Yonkers, N. Y., 1682; Independence Hall, Phila., by *Hamilton*, 1739; Bartram Ho.,

Philadelphia, 1730; Morris (Jumel) Mansion, N. Y. City, 1758; Cortlandt Manor, N. Y. City, 1760?; Verplanck Ho., Fishkill, N. Y., 1740; Fraunces' Tavern, N. Y. City, 1710; Pennsylvania Hospital, Philadelphia, 1796.—Old Swedes' Ch., Philadelphia, 1700; St. Peter's Ch., Philadelphia, 1758; St. Paul's Ch., N. Y. City, 1764; St. John's Ch., N. Y. City, 1807; Christ Church, Philadelphia, 1727, restored 1836.

In Southern Colonies.—Shirley Ho., Va., 1700; Court House, Williamsburg, Va., 1700; Stratford Ho., Va., 1730; Carter's Grove and Westover, Va., 1737; Tulip Hill, Md., 1750; Bull Pringle Mansion, Charleston, S. C., 1765; Crane Ho., Harwood Ho., and Chase Ho., Annapolis, Md., 1770; State House, Annapolis, 1772-85; Chews Ho., Germantown, Pa., 1772; Mt. Vernon, Va., by *G. Washington*, 1784; Brandon, Va., 1790; Sabine Hill, Va., 1790; Tayloe Ho. ("Octagon"), Washington, D. C., 1800; Homewood, Baltimore, Md., 1804; Whitehall, Md., 1804; St. Luke's, Smithfield, Va., 1632?-1680?; St. John's Ch., Hampton, Va., 1660; Christ Ch., Williamsburg, Va., 1678; St. James' Ch., Goose Creek, Va., 1711; Bruton Parish Ch., Va., 1715 (restored 1898); St. Paul's, Norfolk, Va., 1730; St. Phillip's, Charleston, S. C., 1733; St. Michael's, Charleston, S. C., 1752.

II. The Classic Revivals.—White House, Washington, D. C., by *J. Hoban*, 1795; Capitol, Washington, D. C., begun 1793 by *Thornton;* cont. 1795 by *Hallet, Hatfield*, 1803 by *Latrobe*, 1817 by *Bullfinch;* extended 1860 by *Walter;* Mass. State House, Boston, Mass., by *Bulfinch*, 1795; Treasury Dep't, Patent Office, Washington, 1830-45; Marine Exchange, Philadelphia, 1815, by *Strickland;* Girard College, Philadelphia, 1847, by *Walter;* Schuylkill Water Works, Philadelphia; Sub-Treasury, City Bank (Old Custom House, at first Merchants' Exchange), 1844, by *I. Rogers;* St. Mark's Ch., in New York City; Custom House, Boston, Mass; State Capitol, Columbus, O., 1833; many city halls, State capitols, banks and churches in neo-Greek style.

III. The Gothic Revival.—Trinity Ch., New York, 1843-46, by *R. Upjohn;* Grace Ch., do., 1858, by *J. Renwick;* St. George's Ch., do., by *L. Eidlitz;* St. Patrick's Cath., do, by *J. Renwick*, 1870-83; Central Ch., Boston, 1868, by *R. M. Upjohn;* Connecticut Capitol, Hartford, 1876-78, by the same; Fine Arts Museum, Boston, 1876, by *Sturgis* and *Brigham*.

(The monuments of the more recent architectural movements are omitted because of their great number.)

CHAPTER XXVIII.

ORIENTAL ARCHITECTURE.

INDIA, CHINA, AND JAPAN.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED: Cole, *Monographs of Ancient Monuments of India.* Conder, *Notes on Japanese Architecture* (in Transactions of R. I. B. A., for 1886). Cram, *Impressions of Japanese Architecture.* Cunningham, *Archæological Survey of India.* Fergusson, *Indian and Eastern Architecture; Picturesque Illustrations of Indian Architecture.* Le Bon, *Les Monuments de l'Inde.* Morse, *Japanese Houses.* Stirling, *Asiatic Researches.* Consult also the *Journal* and the *Transactions* of the Royal Asiatic Society.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE. The architecture of the non-Moslem countries and races of Asia has been reserved for this closing chapter, in order not to interrupt the continuity of the history of European styles, with which it has no affinity and scarcely even a point of contact. Among them all, India alone has produced monuments of great architectural importance. The buildings of China and Japan, although interesting for their style, methods, and detail, and so deserving at least of brief mention, are for the most part of moderate size and of perishable materials. Outside of these three countries there is little to interest the general student of architecture.

INDIA: PERIODS. It is difficult to classify the non-Mohammedan styles of India, owing to their frequently overlapping, both geographically and artistically; while the lack of precise dates in Indian literature makes the chronology of many of the monuments more or less doubtful. The divisions given below are a

modification of those first established by Fergusson, and are primarily based on the three great religions, with geographical subdivisions, as follows:

THE BUDDHIST STYLE, from the reign of Asoka, *cir.* 250 B.C., to the seventh century A.D. Its monuments occupy mainly a broad band running northeast and southwest, between the Indian Desert and the Dekkan. Offshoots of the style are found as far north as Gandhara, and as far south as Ceylon.

THE JAINA STYLE, akin to the preceding if not derived from it, covering the same territory as well as southern India; from 1000 A.D. to the present time.

THE BRAHMAN or HINDU STYLES, extending over the whole peninsula. They are sub-divided geographically into the NORTHERN BRAHMAN, the CHALUKYAN in the Dekkan, and the DRAVIDIAN in the south; this last style being coterminous with the populations speaking the Tamil and cognate languages. The monuments of these styles are mainly subsequent to the tenth century, though a few date as far back as the seventh.

The great majority of Indian monuments are religious—temples, shrines, and monasteries. Secular buildings do not appear until after the Moslem conquests, and most of them are quite modern.

GENERAL CHARACTER. All these styles possess certain traits in common. While stone and brick are both used, sandstone predominating, the details are in large measure derived from wooden prototypes. Structural lines are not followed in the exterior treatment, purely decorative considerations prevailing. Ornament is equally lavished on all parts of the building, and is bewildering in its amount and complexity. Realistic and grotesque sculpture is freely used, forming multiplied horizontal bands of extraordinary richness and minuteness of execution. Spacious and lofty interiors are rarely attempted, but wonderful effects are produced by seemingly endless repetition of columns

in halls and corridors, and by external emphasis of important parts of the plan by lofty tower-like piles of masonry.

The sources of the various Indian styles, the origin of the forms used, the history of their development, are all wrapped in obscurity. All the monuments show a fully developed style and great command of technical resources from the outset. When, where, and how these were attained is as yet an unsolved mystery. In all its phases previous to the Moslem conquest Indian architecture appears like an indigenous art, borrowing little from foreign styles and having little or no affinity with the arts of Occidental nations.

BUDDHIST STYLE. Although Buddhism originated in the sixth century B.C., the earliest architectural remains of the style date from its wide promulgation in India under Asoka (272–236 B.C.). Buddhist monuments comprise three chief classes of structures: the *stupas* or *topes*, which are mounds more or less domical in shape, enclosing relic-shrines of Buddha, or built to mark some sacred spot; *chaityas*, or temple halls, cut in the rock; and *viharas*, or monasteries. The style of the detail varies considerably in these three classes, but is in general simpler and more massive than in the other styles of India.

TOPES. These are found in groups, of which the most important are at or near Bhilsa in central India, at Manikyala in the northwest, at Amravati in the south, and in Ceylon at Ruanwalli and Tuparamaya. The best known among them is the **Sanchi Tope,** near Bhilsa, 120 feet in diameter and 56 feet high. It is surrounded by a richly carved stone rail or fence, with gateways of elaborate workmanship, having three sculptured lintels crossing the carved uprights. The tope at Manikyala is larger, and dates from the seventh century. It is exceeded in size by many in Ceylon, that at Abayagiri measuring 360 feet in diameter. Few of the topes retain the *tee*, or model of a shrine, which, like a lantern, once crowned each of them.

Besides the topes there are a few stupas of tower-like form, square in plan, of which the most famous is that at **Buddh Gaya,**

near the sacred Bodhi tree, where Buddha attained divine light in 588 B.C.

CHAITYA HALLS. The Buddhist speos-temples—so far as known the only extant halls of worship of that religion, except one at Sanchi—are mostly in the Bombay Presidency, at Ellora, Karli, Ajanta, Nassick, and Bhaja. The earliest, that at Karli, dates from 78 B.C., the latest (at Ellora), *cir.* 600 A.D. They consist uniformly of a broad nave ending in an apse, and covered by a roof like a barrel vault, and two narrow side aisles. In the apse is the *dagoba* or relic shrine, shaped like a miniature tope. The front of the cave was originally adorned with an open-work screen or frame of wood, while the face of the rock about the opening was carved into the semblance of a sumptuous structural façade. Among the finest of these caverns is that at **Karli,** whose massive columns and impressive scale recall Egyptian models, though the resemblance is superficial and has no historic significance. More suggestive is the affinity of many of the columns which stand before these caves to Persian prototypes (see Fig. 21). It is not improbable that both Persian and classic forms were introduced into India through the Bactrian kingdom 250 years B.C. Otherwise we must seek for the origin of nearly all Buddhist forms in a pre-existing wooden architecture, now wholly perished, though its traditions may survive in the wooden screens in the fronts of the caves. While some of these caverns are extremely simple, as at Bhaja, others, especially at **Nassick** and **Ajanta,** are of great splendor and complexity.

VIHARAS. Except at Gandhara in the Punjab, the structural monasteries of the Buddhists were probably all of wood and have long ago perished. The Gandhara monasteries of Jamalgiri and Takht-i-Bahi present in plan three or four courts surrounded by cells. The centre of one court is in both cases occupied by a platform for an altar or shrine. Among the ruins there have been found a number of capitals whose strong resemblance to the Corinthian type is now generally attributed to Byzantine

rather than Bactrian influences. These viharas may therefore be assigned to the sixth or seventh century A.D.

The rock-cut viharas are found in the neighborhood of the chaityas already described. Architecturally they are far more elaborate than the chaityas. Those at Salsette, Ajanta, and Bagh are particularly interesting, with pillared halls or courts, cells, corridors, and shrines. The hall of the **Great Vihara** at **Bagh** is 96 feet square, with 36 columns. Adjoining it is the school-room, and the whole is fronted by a sumptuous rock-cut colonnade 200 feet long. These caves were mostly hewn between the fifth and seventh centuries, at which time sculpture was more prevalent in Buddhist works than previously, and some of them are richly adorned with figures.

JAINA STYLE. The religion and the architecture of the Jainas so closely resemble those of the Buddhists, that recent authorities are disposed to treat the Jaina style as a mere variation or continuation of the Buddhist. Chronologically they are separated by an interval of some three centuries, *cir.* 650–950 A.D., which have left us almost no monuments of either style. The Jaina is moreover easily distinguished from the Buddhist architecture by the great number and elaborateness of its structural monuments. The multiplication of statues of Tirthankhar in the cells about the temple courts, the exuberance of sculpture, the use of domes built in horizontal courses, and the imitation in stone of wooden braces or struts are among its distinguishing features.

JAINA TEMPLES. The earliest examples are on **Mount Abu** in the Indian Desert. Built by Vimalah Sah in 1032, the chief of these consist of a court measuring 140×90 feet, surrounded by cells and a double colonnade. In the centre rises the shrine of the god, containing his statue, and terminating in a lofty tower or *sikhra*. An imposing columnar porch, cruciform in plan, precedes this cell (Fig. 232). The intersection of the arms is covered by a dome supported on eight columns with stone brackets or

struts. The dome and columns are covered with profuse carving and sculptured figures, and the total effect is one of remarkable dignity and splendor. The temple of **Sadri** is much more extensive, twenty minor domes and one of larger size forming cruciform porches on all four sides of the central *sikhra*. The cells about the court are each covered by a small *sikhra*, and these,



FIG. 232.—PORCH OF TEMPLE ON MOUNT ABU.

with the twenty-one domes (four of which are built in three stories), all grouped about the central tower and adorned with an astonishing variety of detail, constitute a monument of the first importance. It was built by Khumbo Rana, about 1450. At **Girnar** are several twelfth-century temples with enclosed instead of open vestibules. One of these, that of **Neminatha,** retains intact its court enclosure and cells, which in most other cases have perished. The temple at **Somnath** resembles it, but is larger; the dome of its porch, 33 feet in diameter, is the largest

Jaina dome in India. Other notable temples are at Gwalior, Khajuraho, and Parasnatha.

In all the Jaina temples the salient feature is the sikhra or *vimana*. This is a tower of approximately square plan, tapering by a graceful curve toward a peculiar terminal ornament shaped like a flattened melon. Its whole surface is variegated by horizontal bands and vertical breaks, covered with sculpture and carving. Next in importance are the domes, built wholly in horizontal courses and resting on stone lintels carried by bracketed columns. These same traits appear in relatively modern examples, as at Delhi.

FIG. 233.—TOWER OF VICTORY, CHITTORE.

TOWERS. A similar predilection for minutely broken surfaces marks the towers which sometimes adjoin the temples, as at Chittore (tower of **Sri Allat,** thirteenth century), or were erected as trophies of victory, like that of **Khumbo Rana** in the same town (Fig. 233). The combination of horizontal and vertical lines, the distribution of the openings and the rich ornamentation of these towers are very interesting, though lacking somewhat in structural propriety of design.

HINDU STYLES: NORTHERN BRAHMAN. The origin of this style is as yet an unsolved problem. Its monuments were mainly built between 600 and 1200 A.D., the oldest being in Orissa, at Bhuwanesevar, Kanaruk, and Puri. In northern India the temples are about equally divided between the two

forms of Brahmanism—the worship of Vishnu or *Vaishnavism*, and that of Siva or *Shaivism*—and do not differ materially in style. At in the Jaina style, the *vimana* is their most striking feature, and this is in most cases adorned with numerous reduced copies of its own form grouped in successive stages against its sides and angles. This curious system of design appears in nearly all the great temples, both of Vishnu and Siva. The Jaina melon ornament is universal, surmounted generally by an urn-shaped finial.

In plan the vimana shrine is preceded by two or three chambers square or polygonal, some with and some without columns. The foremost of these is covered by a roof formed like a stepped pyramid set cornerwise. The fine porch of the ruined temple at **Bindrabun** is cruciform in plan and forms the chief part of the building, the shrine at the further end being relatively small and its tower unfinished or ruined. In some modern examples the antechamber is replaced by an open porch with a Saracenic dome, as at Benares; in others the old type is completely abandoned, as in the temple at **Kantonnuggur** (1704–22). This is a square hall built of terra-cotta, with four three-arched porches and nine towers, more Saracenic than Brahman in general aspect.

The **Kandarya Mahadeo,** at Khajuraho, is the most noted example of the northern Brahman style, and one of the most splendid structures extant. A strong and lofty basement supports an extraordinary mass of roofs, covering the six open porches and the antechamber and hypostyle hall, which precede the shrine, and rising in successive pyramidal masses until the vimana is reached which covers the shrine. This is 116 feet high, but seems much loftier, by reason of the small scale of its constituent parts and the marvellously minute decoration which covers the whole structure. The vigor of its masses and the grand stairways which lead up to it give a dignity unusual for its size, 60 × 109 feet in plan (*cir.* 1000 A.D.).

At Puri, in Orissa, the **Temple** of **Jugganât,** with its double

enclosure and numerous subordinate shrines, the Teli-ka-Mandir at Gwalior, and temples at **Udaipur** near Bhilsa, at **Mukteswara** in Orissa, at Chittore, Benares, and Barolli, are important examples. The few tombs erected subsequent to the Moslem conquest, combining Jaina bracket columns with Saracenic domes and picturesquely situated palaces at Chittore (1450), Oudeypore (1580), and Gwalior, should also be mentioned.

CHALUKYAN STYLE. Throughout a central zone crossing the peninsula from sea to sea about the Dekkan, and extending south to Mysore on the west, the Brahmans developed a distinct style during the later centuries of the Chalukyan dynasty. Its monuments are mainly comprised between 1050 and the Mohammedan conquest in 1310. The most notable examples of the style are found along the southwest coast, at Hullabîd, Baillur, and Somnathpur.

TEMPLES. Chalukyan architecture is exclusively religious and its temples are easily recognized. The plans comprise the same elements as those of the Jainas, but the Chalukyan shrine is always star-shaped externally in plan, and the vimana takes the form of a stepped pyramid instead of a curved outline. The Jaina dome is, moreover, wholly wanting. All the details are of extraordinary richness and beauty, and the breaking up of the surfaces by rectangular projections is skilfully managed so as to produce an effect of great apparent size with very moderate dimensions. All the known examples stand on raised platforms, adding materially to their dignity. Some are double temples, as at Hullabîd (Fig. 234); others are triple in plan. A noticeable feature of the style is the deeply cut stratification of the lower part of the temples, each band or stratum bearing a distinct frieze of animals, figures or ornament, carved with masterly skill. Pierced stone slabs filling the window openings are also not uncommon.

The richest exemplars of the style are the temples of **Baillur** and Somnathpur, and at Hullabîd the **Kait Iswara** and the

incomplete **Double Temple.** The Kurti Stambha, or gate at Worangul, and the Great Temple at **Hamoncondah** should also be mentioned.

DRAVIDIAN STYLE. The Brahman monuments of southern India exhibit a style almost as strongly marked as the Chalukyan. This appears less in their details than in their general plan and conception. The Dravidian temples are not single structures, but aggregations of buildings of varied size and form covering extensive areas enclosed by walls and entered through gates made imposing by lofty pylons called *gopuras*. As if to emphasize these superficial resemblances to Egyptian models, the sanctuary is often low and insignificant. It is preceded by much more imposing porches (*mantapas*) and hypostyle halls or *choultries*, the latter being sometimes of extraordinary extent, though seldom lofty. The choultrie, sometimes called the Hall of 1,000 Columns, is in some cases replaced by pillared corridors of great length and splendor, as at **Ramisseram** and **Madura.** The plans are in most cases wholly irregular, and the architecture, so far from resembling the Egyptian in its scale and massiveness, is marked by the utmost minuteness of orna-

FIG. 234.—TEMPLE OF HULLABÎD. DETAIL.

ment and tenuity of detail, suggesting wood and stucco rather than stone. The **Great Hall** at Chillambaram is but 10 to 12 feet high, and the corridors at Ramisseram, 700 feet long, are but 30 feet high. The effect of *ensemble* of the Dravidian temples is disappointing. They lack the emphasis of dominant masses and the dignity of symmetrical and logical arrangement. The very loftiness of the gopuras makes the buildings of the group within seem low by contrast. In nearly every temple, however, some one feature attracts merited admiration by its splendor, extent, or beauty. Such are the **Choultrie** built by Tirumalla Nayak at Madura (1623–45), measuring 333 × 105 feet; the corridors already mentioned at Ramisseram and in the **Great Temple** at Madura; the gopuras at **Tarputry** and Vellore, and the **Mantapa** of **Parvati** at Chillambaram (1595–1685). Very noticeable are the compound columns of this style, consisting of square piers with slender shafts coupled to them and supporting brackets, as at Chillambaram, Peroor, and Vellore; the richly banded square piers, the grotesques of rampant horses and monsters, and the endless labor bestowed upon minute carving and ornament in superposed bands.

OTHER MONUMENTS. Other important temples are at Tiruvalur, Seringham, Tinevelly, and Conjeveram, all alike in general scheme of design, with enclosures varying from 300 to 1,000 feet in length and width. At **Tanjore** is a magnificent temple with two courts, in the larger of which stands a *pagoda* or shrine with a pyramidal vimana, unusual in Dravidian temples, and beside it the smaller **Shrine** of **Soubramanya** (Fig. 235), a structure of unusual beauty of detail. In both, the vertical lower story with its pilasters and windows is curiously suggestive of Renaissance design. The pagoda dates from the fourteenth, the smaller temple from the fifteenth century.

ROCK-CUT RATHS. All the above temples were built subsequently to the twelfth century. The rock-cut shrines date in some cases as far back as the seventh century; they are called

kylas and *raths*, and are not caves, but isolated edifices, imitating structural designs, but hewn bodily from the rock. Those at Mahavellipore are of diminutive size; but at **Purudkul** there is an extensive temple with shrine, choultrie, and gopura surrounded by a court enclosure measuring 250 × 150 feet (ninth century). More famous still is the elaborate **Kylas** at **Ellora,** of about the same size as the above, but more complex, and complete in its details.

FIG. 235.—SHRINE OF SOUBRAMANYA, TANJORE.

PALACES. At Madura, Tanjore, and Vijayanagar are Dravidian palaces, built after the Mohammedan conquest and in a mixed style. The domical octagonal throne-room and the **Great Hall** at Madura (seventeenth century), the most famous edifices of the kind, were evidently inspired from Gothic models, but how this came about is not known. The Great Hall with

its pointed arched barrel vault of 67 feet span, its cusped arches, round piers, vaulting shafts, and triforium, appears strangely foreign to its surroundings.

CAMBODIA. The subject of Indian architecture cannot be dismissed without at least brief mention of the immense temple of **Nakhon Wat** in Cambodia. This stupendous creation covers an area of a full square mile, with its concentric courts, its encircling moat or lake, its causeways, porches, and shrines, dominated by a central structure 200 feet square with nine pagoda-like towers. The corridors around the inner court have square piers of almost classic Roman type. The rich carving, the perfect masonry, and the admirable composition of the whole leading up to the central mass, indicate architectural ability of a high order. Very remarkable also are the ruins in Java at Borabador.

CHINESE ARCHITECTURE. No purely Mongolian nation appears ever to have erected buildings of first-rate importance. It cannot be denied, however, that the Chinese are possessed of considerable decorative skill and mechanical ingenuity; and these qualities are the most prominent elements in their buildings. Great size and splendor, massiveness and originality of construction, they do not possess. Built in large measure of wood, cleverly framed and decorated with a certain richness of color and ornament, with a large element of the grotesque in the decoration, the Chinese temples, pagodas, and palaces are interesting rather than impressive. There is not a single architectural monument of imposing size or of great antiquity, so far as we know. The celebrated **Porcelain Tower** of Nankin is no longer extant, having been destroyed in the Tæping rebellion in 1850. It was a nine-storied polygonal pagoda 236 feet high, revetted with porcelain tiles, and was built in 1412. The largest of Chinese temples, that of the **Great Dragon** at Pekin, is a circular structure of moderate size, though its enclosure is nearly a mile square. Pagodas with diminishing stories, elaborately carved entrance gates

and successive terraces are mainly relied upon for effect. They show little structural art, but much clever ornament. Like the monasteries and the vast *lamaseries* of Thibet, they belong to the Buddhist religion.

Aside from the ingenious framing and bracketing of the carpentry, the most striking peculiarity of Chinese buildings is their broad-spreading tiled roofs. These invariably slope downward in a curve, and the tiling, with its hip-ridges, crestings, and finials in terra-cotta or metal, adds materially to the picturesqueness of the general effect. Color and gilding are freely used, and in some cases—as in a summer pavilion at Pekin—porcelain tiling covers the walls, with brilliant effect. The chief wonder is that this resource of the architectural decorator has not been further developed in China, where porcelain and earthenware are otherwise treated with such remarkable skill.

JAPANESE ARCHITECTURE. Apparently associated in race with the Chinese and Koreans, the Japanese are far more artistic in temperament than either of their neighbors. The refinement and originality of their decorative art have given it a wide reputation. Unfortunately the prevalence of earthquakes has combined with the influence of the traditional habits of the people to prevent the maturing of a truly monumental architecture. Except for the terraces, gates, and enclosures of their palaces and temples, wood is the predominant building material. It is used substantially as in China, the framing, dovetailing, bracketing, broad eaves and tiled roofs of Japan closely resembling those of China. The chief difference is in the greater refinement and delicacy of the Japanese details and the more monumental disposition of the temple terraces, the beauty of which is greatly enhanced by skilful landscape gardening. The gateways recall somewhat those of the Sanchi Tope in India (p. 418), but are commonly of wood. Owing to the danger from earthquakes, lofty towers and pagodas are rarely seen.

The domestic architecture of Japan, though interesting for its

arrangements, and for its sensible and artistic use of the most flimsy materials, is too trivial in scale, detail and construction to receive more than passing reference. Even the great palace at Tokio,* covering an immense area, is almost entirely composed of one-storied buildings of wood, with little of splendor or architectural dignity.

MONUMENTS: (additional to those in text). BUDDHIST: Topes at Sanchi, Sonari, Satdara, Andher, in Central India; at Sarnath, near Benares; at Jelalabad and Salsette; in Ceylon at Anuradhapura, Tuparamaya, Lankaramaya.—Grotto temples (chaityas), mainly in Bombay and Bengal Presidencies; at Behar, especially the Lomash Rishi, and Cuttack; at Bhaja, Bedsa, Ajunta, and Ellora (Wiswakarma Cave); in Salsette, the Kenheri Cave.—Vilharas: Structural at Nalanda and Sarnath, demolished; rock-cut in Bengal, at Cuttack, Udayagiri (the Ganesa); in the west, many at Ajanta, also at Bagh, Bedsa, Bhaja, Nassick (the Nahapana, Yadnya Sri, etc.), Salsette, Ellora (the Dekrivaria, etc.). In Nepâl, stupas of Swayanbunath and Bouddhama.

JAINA: Temples at Aiwulli, Kanaruc (Black Pagoda), and Purudkul; groups of temples at Palitana, Girnar, Mount Abu, Somnath, Parisnath; the Sas Bahu at Gwalior, 1093; Parswanatha and Ganthai (650) at Khajuraho; temple at Gyraspore, 7th century; modern temples at Ahmedabad (Huttising), Delhi, and Sonaghur; in the south at Moodbidri, Sravana Belgula; towers at Chittore.

NORTHERN BRAHMAN: Temples, Parasumareswara (500 A.D.), Mukteswara, and Great Temple (600-650), all at Bhuwaneswar, among many others; of Papanatha at Purudkul; grotto temples at Dhumnar, Ellora, and Poonah; temples at Chandravati, Udaipur, and Amritsur (the last modern); tombs of Singram Sing and others at Oudeypore; of Rajah Baktawar at Ulwar, and others at Goverdhun; ghâts or landings at Benares and elsewhere.

CHALUKYAN: Temples at Buchropully and Hamoncondah, 1163; ruins at Kalyani; grottoes of Hazar Khutri.

DRAVIDIAN: Rock-cut temples (raths) at Mahavellipore; Tiger

* See Transactions R. I. B. A., 52d year, 1886, article by R. J. Conder, pp. 185-214.

Cave at Saluvan Kuppan; temples at Pittadkul (Purudkul), Tiruvalur, Combaconum, Vellore, Peroor, Vijayanagar; pavilions at Tanjore and Vijayanagar.

There are also many temples in the Kashmir Valley difficult of assignment to any of the above styles and religions.

GLOSSARY

OF TERMS NOT DEFINED IN THE TEXT.

ALCAZAR (Span., from Arabic *Al Kasr*), a palace or castle, especially of a governing official.

ARCHIVOLT, a band or group of mouldings decorating the wall-face of an arch; or a transverse arch projecting slightly from the surface of a barrel or groined vault.

ASTYLAR, without columns.

BALNEA, a Roman bathing establishment, less extensive than the *thermæ*.

BEL ÉTAGE, the principal story of a building, containing the reception rooms and saloons; usually the second story (first above the ground story).

BROKEN ENTABLATURE, an entablature which projects forward over each column or pilaster, returning back to the wall and running along with diminished projection between the columns, as in the Arch of Constantine (Fig. 63).

CANTONED PIERS, piers adorned with columns or pilasters at the corners or on the outer faces.

CARTOUCHE (Fr.), an ornament shaped like a shield or oval. In Egyptian hieroglyphics, the oval encircling the name of a king.

CAVETTO, a moulding of concave, quarter-round section.

CHEVRON, a V-shaped ornament.

CHRYSELEPHANTINE, of ivory and gold; used of statues in which the nude portions are of ivory and the draperies of gold.

CONSOLE, a large scroll-shaped bracket or ornament having its broadest curve at the bottom.

CORINTHIANESQUE, resembling the Corinthian; used of capitals having corner-volutes and acanthus leaves, but combined otherwise than in the classic Corinthian type.

EMPAISTIC, made of, or overlaid with, sheet-metal beaten or hammered into decorative patterns.

EXEDRÆ, curved seats of stone; niches or recesses, sometimes of considerable size, provided with seats for the public.

FENESTRATION, the whole system or arrangement of windows and openings in an architectural composition.

FOUR-PART. A four-part vault is a groined vault formed by the intersection of two barrel vaults. Its diagonal edges or *groins* divide it into four sections, triangular in plan, each called a *compartment*.

GIGANTOMACHIA, a group or composition representing the mythical combat between the gods and the giants.

HALF-TIMBERED, constructed with a timber framework showing externally, and filled in with masonry or brickwork or lath-and-plaster.

IMAUM, imâm, a Mohammedan priest.

KAABAH, the sacred shrine at Mecca, a nearly cubical structure hung with black cloth.

KARAFAH, a region in Cairo containing the so-called tombs of the Khalifs.

LACONICUM, the sweat-room in a Roman bath; usually of domical design in the larger *thermæ*.

LADY CHAPEL, in many cathedrals the central or axial chapel of the *chevet*, usually longer and richer than the rest, and dedicated to the Virgin Mary; any chapel to the Virgin may receive the name.

MEZZANINE, a low, intermediate story.

MUEDDIN (or *muezzin*), a Mohammedan mosque-official who calls to prayer.

NARTHEX, a porch or vestibule running across the front of a basilica or church.

NEO-GOTHIC, } in a style which
NEO-MEDIÆVAL, } seeks to revive and adapt or apply to modern uses the forms of the Middle Ages.

OCULUS, a circular opening, especially in the crown of a dome.

OGEE ARCH, one composed of two juxtaposed S-shaped or wavy curves, meeting in a point at the top.

PALÆSTRA, an establishment among the ancient Greeks for physical training.

PAVILION (Fr. *pavillon*), ordinarily a light open structure of ornate design. As applied to architectural composition, a projecting section of a façade, usually rectangular in plan, and having its own distinct mass of roof.

PRESBYTERY, the eastern part of the choir, beyond the choir stalls or choir proper, reserved for the officiating clergy, and

raised a step or two higher than the choir itself.

QUARRY ORNAMENT, any ornament covering a surface with two series of reticulated lines enclosing approximately quadrangular spaces or meshes.

QUATREFOIL, with four leaves or *foils;* composed of four arcs of circles meeting in cusps pointing inward.

QUOINS, slightly projecting blocks of stone, alternately long and short, decorating or strengthening a corner or angle of a façade.

RETRO-CHOIR, any space east of the apse or presbytery of a church, especially a chapel or enlarged ambulatory.

REVETMENT, a veneering or sheathing.

RUSTICATION, treatment of the masonry with blocks having roughly broken faces, or with deeply grooved or bevelled joints.

SOFFIT, the under-side of an architrave, beam, arch, or corona.

SPANDRIL, the triangular wall-space between two contiguous arches.

SQUINCH, a bit of conical vaulting filling in the angles of a square so as to provide an octagonal or circular base for a dome or lantern.

STOA, an open colonnade for public resort.

TEPIDARIUM, the hot-water hall or chamber of a Roman bath.

TYMPANUM, the flat space comprised between the horizontal and raking cornices of a pediment, or between a lintel and the arch over it.

VOUSSOIR, any one of the radial stones composing an arch.

INDEX OF ARCHITECTS.

The *surname* is in all cases followed by a comma.

Architects now living (1909) are designated either by the date of birth and a dash (—), or by the abbreviation *contemp.*, for contemporary.

Abadie, Paul (1812-84) 381
Adam, Robert (1727-92) 341
Agnolo (Baglioni), Baccio d' (1462-1543) 295
Agnolo (Baglioni), Gabriele d' (15th-16th cent.) 291
Alan of Walsingham (14th cent.) 228
Alberti, Leo Battista (1404-73) 281, 284, 285
Alessi, Galeazzo (1500-72) 303, 304, 306
Ammanati, Bartolommeo (1511-92) 303, 305
Anthemius of Tralles (6th cent.) 127
Antonio da San Gallo, see San Gallo
Antonio, Master (13th cent.) 264
Arnolfo di Cambio, (1232-1303) 262
Arras, Matthew of (14th cent.) 249

Baccio d' Agnolo Baglioni (1462-1543) 295
Ballu, Théodore (1817-85) 379, 381
Baltard, Victor (1805-74) 379
Barry, Sir Charles (1789-1850) 388
Basevi, George (1790-1850 ?) 366
Battista, Juan (16th cent.) 358
Bénard, Émile (contemp.) 413
Benci di Cione (d. 1388) 271
Benedetto da Majano (1442-97) 285, 286
Bernardo di Lorenzo, (15th cent.) 286
Bernini, Lorenzo (1589-1680) 300, 307, 326
Berruguete, Alonso (1480-1561) 356, 358, 359
Bianchi, (16th cent.) 307
Bianchi, (18th-19th cent.) 310
Bondone, Giotto di (1267-1337) 263, 268
Borromini, Francesco (1599-1667) 307, 308, 309, 356
Borset, (16th cent.) 342
Bramante Lazzari, Donato (1444-1514) 293, 294, 295, 298, 299, 304, 328
Brandon, John Raphael (1817-77) 386
Bregno (or Rizzo), Antonio (d. 1498) 288, 289

Brongniart, Alex. Théodore (1739-1813) 371
Brunelleschi, Filippo di Ser (1377-1444) 280, 281, 284, 285, 293
Bulfinch, Charles (1763-1844) 402
Bullant, Jean (1515-78) 323
Buon, Bartolommeo (16th cent.) 288
Buonarotti, Michel Angelo (Agnolo) (1475-1564) 100, 293, 297, 298, 299, 300, 303
Burges, William (1827-81) 388

Callicrates, (5th cent. B.C.) 64
Cambio, Arnolfo di (1232-1303) 260
Campbell, Colin (d. 1727) 341
Campello, (13th cent.) 260
Caprarola, Cola da (16th cent.) 298
Caprino, Meo del (1430-1501)
Carrère, John M. (1854—) 412, 413, 414
Chalgrin, Jean F. T. (1739-1811) 370
Chambers, Sir William (1726-96) 341
Chambiges, Pierre (d. 1544) 320
Chrismas, Gerard (16th-17th cent.) 335
Christodoulos, (15th cent.) 150
Churriguera, Don Josef (d. 1725) 356
Civitale, Matteo (1435-1501) 286
Cola da Caprarola (16th cent.) 298
Collcutt, Thomas (contemp.) 390
Columbe, Michel (1430-1512) 316
Cope, Charles F. (d. 1902) 413
Cortona, Domenico di (Boccador) (d. 1549) 321
Cosmati, The (13th cent.) 269
Cossutius, (2d cent. B.C.) 69
Cram, Ralph A. (contemp.) 413
Cronaca, Simone (Porlainolo) (1457-1508) 285, 295

Dance, George (1695-1768) 341, 365
Dance, George (1741-1825) 341
De Brosse, Salomon (1560-1626) 325
De Cotte, Robert (17th cent.) 325
De Fabris, (d. 1887) 266
De Key, Lieven (late 16th cent.) 344
De Keyser, Hendrik (1565-1621) 344
Della Porta, Giacomo (1541-1604) 297, 299, 303, 304
Della Robbia, Luca (1400-82) 286
Della Stella, Paolo (16th cent.) 347
De l'Orme, Philibert (1515-70) 323, 324
Déperthes, L. (19th cent.) 381
Derrand, François (17th cent.) 325
Desiderio da Settignano (1428-64) 286
De Tessin, Nicodemus (1654-1728) 344
De Vriendt (or Floris), Cornelius (1518-75) 342
Diego de Siloë (early 16th cent.) 356
Domenico di Cortona (d. 1549) 323
Donatello (Donato Nicolò di

Betto Bardi) (cir. 1382-1466) 280
Dosio, Giovanni Antonio (1533-1610) 295
Duban, Félix (1797-1870) 372
Duc, Louis Joseph (1802-79) 372, 373
Du Cerceau, Jean Batiste (1545-1602) 324

Edington, Bishop (14th cent.) 230
Egaz, Enrique de (see below)
Elmes, James (1782-1862) 367
Enrique de Egaz, (16th cent.) 356
Erlach, Fischer von (1650-1723) 354, 367
Erwin von Steinbach, (13th-14th cent.) 246, 248

Fain, Pierre (early 16th cent.) 317
Federighi, Antonio (d. 1490) 286
Ferguson (contemp.) 413
Ferstel, H. von (1828-83) 383
Fiesole, Mino da (1430-84) 286
Filarete, Antonio (1400-68 ?) 287
Fischer von Erlach, (1650-1723) 354
Flitcroft, Henry (1697-1769) 341
Floris (De Vriendt) Cornelius (1518-75) 342
Fontaine, Pierre L. F. (1762-1853)
Fontana, Domenico (1543-1607) 299, 304, 309
Fontana, Giovanni (16th-17th cent.) 309
Fra Giocondo (d. cir. 1517) 291
Fra Ristoro (13th cent.) 261
Fra Sisto (13th cent.) 261
Fuga, Ferdinando (1699-1784) 310
Flagg, Ernest (contemp.) 414

Gabriel, Jacques Ange (1698-1782)
Gabriele d'Angolo, (Baglione) (15th-16th cent.) 291
Gaddi, Taddeo (14th cent.) 268
Gadyer, Pierre (16th cent.) 321
Galilei, Alessandro (1691-1737) 310
Garnier, Charles (1825-98) 380
George, Ernest (contemp.) 390
Giacomo della Porta, see Della Porta
Giacomo di Pietrasanta, (15th cent.) 290
Gibbs, James (1683-1754) 340, 365, 397, 401
Gibson, Robert W. (1857—) 407
Gilbert, Cass (1857—) 409, 413, 414
Giocondo, Fra (d. cir. 1517) 291
Giotto di Bondone, (1267-1337) 263, 268
Giuliano da Majano (1432-90) 291
Giuliano da San Gallo (1445-1510) 283, 295, 299
Giulio Romano, (1492-1546) 293, 297, 350
Goodhue (contemp.) 413
Goujon, Jean (1510-72) 323, 327
Guimard, Henri (contemp.) 392
Gumiel, Pedro (16th cent.) 357

Hallet, Stephen (Étienne) (late 18th cent.) 402
Hensen, Theophil (1813-90) 369

Hastings, Thomas (1856—) 412, 413
Have, Theodore (16th-17th cent.) 335
Hawksmoor, (1666-1736) 340
Hendrik de Keyser, (1565-1621) 344
Henri de Narbonne, (14th cent.)
Henry of Gmünd, (14th cent.) 260
Herrera, Francisco (1622-85) 360
Herrera, Juan d' (1530-1597) 356, 358, 359
Hittorff, Jacques Ignace (1793-1867) 372, 380
Hoban, Thomas (? 1760-1817 ?) 402
Hübsch, Heinrich (1795-1863) 383, 384
Hunt, Richard Morris (1828-95) 405, 411

Ictinus, (5th cent. B.C.) 64, 67
Inigo Jones, (1572-1652) 336, 340, 341
Isodorus of Miletus, (6th cent.) 127
Ivara (or Juvara), Ferdinando (1685-1735) 360, 373

Jacobus of Meran, (13th cent.) 260
Jansen, Bernard (16th-17th cent.) 335
Jefferson, Thomas (1743-1826) 402
John of Padua, (16th cent.) 335
Jones, Inigo (1572-1652) 336, 340, 341
Juan Battista (16th cent.) 358
Juckher of Cologne, (15th cent.) 246

Kearsley, Dr. (18th cent.) 398
Kent, William (1685-1748) 341
Keyser, Hendrik de (1565-1621) 344
Klenze, Leo von (1784-1864) 368, 369, 375

Labrouste, Henri P. F. (1801-75) 372
Lassus, Jean B. A. (1807-57) 379
Latrobe, Benjamin H. (1762-1820) 402
Laurana, Francesco (15th cent.) 316
Laurana, Luciano (d. 1483) 291
Le Breton, Gilles (d. 1552) 319
Le Duc, Gabriel (17th-18th cent.) 329
Lefuel, Hector M. (1810-80) 380
Lemercier, Jacques (1590-1654) 325, 329
Lemercier, Pierre (16th cent.) 318
Le Muet (17th cent.) 329
Le Nepveu, Pierre (Trinqueau) (d. 1538) 321
Lescot, Pierre (1515-78) 321, 322, 327
Le Vau, (or Levau) Louis (1612-1670) 325, 326, 329
Lieven de Key, (16th cent.) 344
Ligorio, Pirro (d. cir. 1586) 297
Lippi, Annibale (2d half 16th cent.) 297
Lira, Valentino di (16th cent.) 351
Lombardi, Antonio (d. 1516) 288

Lombardi, Martino (16th cent.) 288
Lombardi, Moro (15th cent.) 288
Lombardi, Pietro (1433-1515) 288, 290
Lombardi, Tullio (d. 1532) 288, 298
Longhena, Baldassare (1604-82) 308, 309
Lorenzo, Bernardo di (15th cent.) 286
Louis, Victor (1731-1800) 370
Luca della Robbia, (1400-82) 286
Ludwig, Friedrich (17th-18th cent.) 360
Lunghi, Martino (the Elder) (late 16th cent.) 309

Machuca (16th cent.) 359
Maderna, Carlo (1556-1629) 300, 307, 308, 309
Maitani, Lorenzo (late 13th cent.) 265
Majano, Benedetto da (1442-97) 285, 286
Majano, Giuliano da (1432-90) 290, 291
Mangin, L. (18th-19th cent.) 401
Mansart, François (1598-1666) 329
Mansart, Jules Hardouin (1647-1708) 326, 328, 329
Marchionne, (late 18th cent.) 310
Marini, Giovanni (17th cent.) 347
Martino, Pietro di 291
Matteo Cicitali, (1435-1501) 286
Matthew of Arras, (d. 1352) 249
McComb, John (17th-18th cent.) 401
McKim, Charles F. (contemp.) 412, 413
Mead, W. Rutherford (contemp.) 412, 413
Meo del Caprino, (1430-1501) 290
Meran, Jacobus of (13th cent.) 260
Métézeau, Louis (1559-1615) 324
Michel Angelo (see Buonarotti)
Michelozzi, Michelozzo (1397-1472) 284, 287
Mino da Fiesole, (1430-84) 286
Mnesicles, (5th cent. B.C.) 66
Mullett, A. B. (d. 1890) 404

Narbonne, Henri de (14th-15th cent.) 254
Nepveu, Pierre le (Trinqueau) (d. 1538) 321

Ohmüller, Daniel J. (1791-1839) 383
Olbrich, J. M. (d. 1908) 392

Palladio, Andrea (1518-80) 303, 304, 326, 336, 358
Percier, Charles (1764-1838) 370
Perrault, Claude (1613-88) 327
Peruzzi, Baldassare (1484-1536) 273, 296, 299
Phidias, (5th cent. B.C.) 64
Philibert de l'Orme, (1515-70) 323
Pietrasanta, Giacomo di (2d half 15th cent.) 290, 291
Pintelli, Baccio (d. cir. 1492) 291
Pisano, Giovanni (d. 1320) 265
Pisano, Niccolò (1207-78) 277
Polaert, (late 19th cent.) 391

Post, George B. (1838—) 413
Poyet, (early 19th cent.) 371
Price, Bruce (1847-1902) 409
Pugin, Augustus (1762-1832) 386
Pugin, A. Welby (1812-52) 386
Pythius, (4th cent. B.C.) 72

Raphael Sanzio (d'Urbino) (1483-1520) 293, 295, 296, 298, 299
Renwick, James (1818-95) 404
Revett, Nicholas (1721-1804) 364, 367
Richardson, Henry Hobson (1828-86) 405, 407, 408
Rickman, Thomas (1776-1841) 386
Ristoro, Fra (13th cent.) 261
Rizzo, Antonio (d. 1498) 288, 289
Rocco Lurago, (16th cent.) 307
Rogers, Isaiah (19th cent.) 403
Romano, Giulio (1494-1546) 293, 297
Rossellini, Bernardo (1409-64) 290
Ruiz, Fernando (16th cent.) 359

Sacconi, Giuseppe (d. 1905) 382
Salvi, Niccola (1699-1751) 310
Sammichele, Michele (1489-1554) 298, 303, 305, 337
San Gallo, Antonio da (the Elder) (1455-1534) 298
San Gallo, Antonio da (the Younger) (1485-1546) 293, 296, 299, 310
San Gallo, Giuliano da (1445-1516) 283, 295, 299
Sansovino, Giacopo Tatti (1479-1570) 293, 298, 303, 305, 309
Satyrus, (4th cent. B.C.) 72
Scamozzi, Vincenzo (1552-1616) 304, 341
Schinkel, Friedrich (1781-1841) 368, 369, 384
Schmidt, (late 18th cent.) 367
Schmidt, Friedrich (1825-91) 386
Scott, (General) (19th cent.) 390
Scott, Sir Gilbert (1811-78) 388, 389
Semper, Ottfried (1803-79) 384
Sens, William of (d. 1180) 223
Servandoni (1695-1776) 330
Settingnano, Desiderio da (1428-1464) 286
Shaw, Norman (contemp.) 390
Siccardsburg, August S. von (1813-64) 384
Siloë, Diego di (early 16th cent.) 356
Smirke, Robert (1781-1867) 366
Smithson, Robert (early 17th cent.) 335
Soane, Sir John (1753-1857) 341, 366
Soufflot, J. J. (1709-80) 330
Steindl, (contemp.) 386
Steinbach, Erwin von (13th-14th cent.) 246, 248
Stella, Paolo della (16th cent.) 347
Stern, Raphael (early 19th cent.) 310, 373
Stewardson, John (d. 1896) 413
Street, George Edmund (1824-81) 388
Stuart, James (1713-88) 364, 367
Stühler, (19th cent.) 368

Sullivan, Louis H. (contemp.) 410

Talenti, Francesco di (d. 1370) 264, 268
Talenti, Simone di (late 14th cent.) 271
Tessin, Nicodemus de (17th-18th cent.) 344
Thomson, Alexander (1817-75) 367
Thornton (end of 18th cent.) 402
Thorpe, John (early 17th cent.) 335
Titz, (19th cent.) 384
Torregiano, (1472-1522) 335
Towne, Ithiel (18th-19th cent.) 401
Trevigi, (16th cent.) 335
Train, Émile (19th cent.) 379

Upjohn, Richard (1802-78) 404
Upjohn, Richard M. (1828-1904) 406

Val del Vira (15th cent.) 356
Valentino di Lira (16th cent.) 351
Van Aken (16th cent.) 351
Van Brugh, Sir John (1666-1726) 340
Van Noort, William (16th cent.) 343
Van Noye, Sebastian (16th cent.) 343
Van Vitelli, Luigi (1700-73) 309
Vasari, Giorgio (1512-74) 162, 262, *note*
Viart, Charles (d. 1537) 317
Viel, (19th cent.) 380
Vignola, Giacomo Barozzi da (1507-72) 293, 296, 303, 304, 305
Vignon, Barthélémy (1762-1820) 370
Viollet-le-Duc, Eugène Emmanuel (1814-79) 219, 379, 371
Vischer, Kaspar (16th cent.) 351
Vischer, Peter (1465 ?-1529) 355
Visconti, Louis T. J. (1791-1853) 380, 386
Vitoni, Ventura (1442-1522) 298
Vitruvius Pollio, (1st cent. B.C.) 57, 72, 78
Von der Nüll (1812-68) 384
Von Kleuze, Leo (1784-1864) 368, 369, 375

Wagner, Otto (contemp.) 393
Wallot, Jean (16th cent.) 334, 342
Wallot, Paul (19th cent.) 385
Walsingham, Alan of (14th cent.) 228
Walter, Thomas Ustick (1804-87) 403
Ware, William Robert (1832—) 405
Waterhouse, Alfred (19th cent.) 388, 389
Webb, Sir Aston (contemp.) 390
White, Stanford (d. 1907) 412, 413
Wilkins, William (1778-1839) 367
William of Sens, (d. 1180) 223
William of Wykeham, (1324-1404) 230
Wood, (18th cent.) 341
Wren, Sir Christopher (1632-1723) 337, 339, 340, 365, 397, 401

Ziebland, (1800-73) 383

INDEX.

THE buildings are arranged according to location. Those which appear only in the lists of monuments at the ends of chapters are omitted. *Numerals in parentheses refer to illustrations.*

ABAYAGIRI. Tope 418
ABBEVILLE. St. Wulfrand 211, 216
ABOU-SIMBEL (see IPSAMBOUL)
ABU-SEIR. Stepped pyramid 9
ABYDOS. Columns 12. Temple 19, 21. Tombs 12 (5)
ADDEH. Grotto-temple 22
ADRIANOPLE 151. Mosque of Selim 151
ÆMILIA. Churches in 157, 267
ÆGINA. Sculptures 58. Aphesa temple 63. Temple of Zeus, of Athena 63 *note*
AFRICA, North. Arab works 140
AGRA 148, 149. Pearl Mosque 148. Taj Mahal 148 (87)
AGRIGENTUM. Zeus temple 56 *note*, 62 (33)
AHMEDABAD 147
AIX-LA-CHAPELLE. Minster (Palatine Chapel) 174. Palace of Charlemagne 178
AIZANOI. Zeus temple 68. Theatre 71
AJANTA. Brahman chaityas 419; vihares 420
AJMIR 147
ALBANO. Tomb 89
ALBANY. All Saints' Cathedral 407. Capitol 404
ALBY Cathedral 169, 188, 208, 214, 254 (126)
ALCALA DE HENARES (Alcala). Archbishop's Palace 358. College 357. Tombs in cathedral 360
ALCANTARA 108. Bridge 167
ALENÇON Cathedral 211, 215
ALEXANDRIA TROAS. Palæstra 72
ALGIERS 92, 108, 119. Mosques 140
ALLAHABAD. Akbar's Palace 148
ALTENBURG Cathedral 246. Town hall 352
AMADA. Columns 12
AMBOISE. Castle 316
AMIENS Cathedral 193, 200, 204, 206, 208, 209, 223, 224, 236, 248 (125); west front 210, 211, 215, 231
AMRAVATI. Tope 418
AMSTERDAM. Bourse (Exchange), Hanse House, Town hall 336
ANCY LE FRANC. Château 323
ANET. Château 323
ANGERS. Cathedral St. Maurice 203. Hospital St. Jean 217
ANGORA (Ancyra) 118
ANGOULÊME. Cathedral 166

Ani 134
Annapolis. Harwood and Hammond Houses 398. Naval Academy 413
Antioch 116
Antiphellus. Theatre 70. Tombs 73
Antwerp. Cathedral 193, 251. Town hall 342, 344
Aquitania. Churches 166, 170, 182, 381
Aranjuez. Palace 360
Arezzo. Cathedral 261. Sta. Maria della Pieve 159
Argos. Gates 45
Arizona. Spanish churches 400
Arles. St. Trophime 167. St. Gilles 167
Armenia. Vaulting 123. Byzantine churches 134
Aschaffenburg. Church 247
Asheville. Biltmore House 411
Asia Minor 53, 56, 58, 63, 67, 71, 72, 108, 118, 123
Aspendus. Theatre 71
Assebona. Temple 22
Assisi. Church of St. Francis (S. Francesco) 261, 262, 263
Assos 56. Public square 70. Temple 62
Assyria. Character of monuments 29
Asti. Church 261
Astorga. Rood-screen 360
Athens. Academy 374. Acropolis 64, 70. Agora Gate 69. Arch of Hadrian 64. Cathedral 134. Choragic Monument of Lysicrates 67, 367 (30, 38). Erectheum 65 (32, 35, 36). Museum 374. Odeon of Regilla (Herodes Atticus) 69, 71, 72. Parthenon 59, 64, 131, 368 (Frontispiece, 31 *d*, 34). Propylæa 59, 66, 69, 367 (37). Stoa of Attalus 68. Temple of Nike Apteros 56 *note*, 65, 66. Temple of Olympian Zeus 69 (39). Theatre of Dionysus 70, 71. Theseum 63. Tower of Winds (Clepsydra of Cyrrhestes) 53, 68. University 374
Attica 51, 56
Audenarde (see Oudenärde)
Augsburg. Town hall 352
Austria 364
Autun. City Gates 108. Cathedral 169
Auvergne. Apsidal Chapels in 207
Auxerre. Cathedral 200, 204
Avignon. Notre Dame des Doms 166
Avila. S. Vincente 188, 253; tombs in 360
Azay-le-Rideau. Château 321

Baalbec (Heliopolis) 84, 108. Circular Temple 94. Temple of Sun 92
Bab-el-Molouk. Tombs 14
Babylon 31
Bagdad 145, 146
Bagh. Viharas, Great Vihara 420
Baillur. Temples 424
Bamberg. Church 248
Barcelona. Cathedral 193, 254. Sta. Maria del Pi 254
Bari. Cathedral 162
Barolli. Hindu temple 424
Basle. Spalenthor 250

Bassæ (Phigalæa). Temple of Apollo Epicurius 67
Batalha. Church, mausoleum 256
Bath. Public buildings 365
Bavaria 350, 368
Bayeux. Cathedral 200, 208
Bayonne. Cathedral 200
Beaugency. Town hall 322
Beaumesnil. Château 324
Beaune. Hospital 217
Beauvais. Cathedral 193, 203, 214, 241; chapels 208; choir 215, 223; size 209
Beit-el-Wali. Rock-cut Temple 22
Belem. Church 256, 360. Cloister, tower 360
Belgium 251, 252, 342
Benares. Hindu temples 423, 424
Beni Hassan. Columns 12, 24, 51. Speos Artemidos 22. Tombs 11 (6, 7)
Bergamo. Town hall 271
Berlin. Brandenburg Gate 367. Industrial Museum 368 (207). New Museum 368. Parliament House (Reichrathsgebäude) 385. Theatres 369, 384
Bethlehem. Church of the Nativity 115
Bhaja. Chaityas 419
Bhilsa 424. Topes 418, 429
Bhuwaneswar. Hindu temples 422
Bidar 146
Bijapur 147. Tomb of Mahmûd 148, 153 (86). Jumma Musjid 148. Mogul architecture 149, 153
Biltmore House 411
Bindrabun. Ruined temple 423
Birs Nimroud. Stepped pyramid 31
Blenheim House 340 (195)
Blois. Château 219, 317, 319, 329 (180, 181)
Bohemia 346, 347
Bokhara 146
Bologna 157. Brick houses 272. Campo Santo 391. Churches 282, 298. Fountains 309. Frati di S. Spirito 284. Local style 288. Palaces: — Bevilacqua 288; Communale (town hall) 271; Fava 288. Renaissance churches 282, 298. S. Francesco 261, 268. S. Petronio 262, 263, 264, 268. Sta. Maria dei Servi 268
Bombay Presidency 419
Bonn. Minster 177. Baptistery 177
Borabador (Java). Great Temple 428
Bordeaux. Cathedral spires 212. Grand Théatre 370.
Boston (England). St. Botolph's tower 237
Boston (Mass., U. S. A.). Ames Building 409. Custom House 403. Faneuil Hall 400. Fine Arts Museum (old) 407. Hancock House 399. Old State House 400. Old South Church 398. Public Library 412, 414. State House 402. Trinity Church 407 (227)
Bourg-en-Bresse. Bron Church 216
Bourges. Cathedral 193, 200,

202, 204, 208, 209, 253; chapels 207; size 209; portals 211. House of Jacques Cœur 217, 219 (132)
Bournazel. Château 321
Bowden Park 367
Bozrah. Cathedral 117 (70)
Brandenburg. St. Catherine 245, 249. St. Godehard 249
Bremen. Town hall 250, 352
Brescia. Sta. Maria dei Miracoli 297
Brieg. Piastenschloss 351
Bristol. Cathedral, piers 180. St. Mary's Redcliffe 237
Bruges. Ancien Greffe 342. Cloth hall 352. Ste. Anne 343. Town hall 252
Brunswick. Burg Dankwarderode 178. Town hall 250
Brusa 150. (See list 154)
Brussels. Bourse 391. Cathedral (Ste. Gudule) 251. Palais de Justice 391. Renaissance houses 343 (197). Town hall 252
Bubastis. Temple 14
Buda-Pesth. Parliament House, Synagogue 386
Buddh Gaya. Tope or stupa 418
Buffalo. Guaranty Building 410
Bulach. Basilica 383
Burgundy. Cathedrals in 200
Burghley House 335 (191)
Burgos. Cathedral 253; chapels 256 (150)
Bury. Château 321
Byzantium 92, 120. See Constantinople

Caen. Churches 169, 180. St. Étienne (Abbaye aux Hommes) and Ste. Trinité (Abbaye aux Dames) 170; St. Pierre 318. Hôtel d'Écoville 322
Cahors. Cathedral 165
Caserta Vecchia 162
Cairo 136. Karafah (Tombs of Khalifs) 137, 138. Mohammedan monuments (list) 153. Mosque of Amrou 136, 137; of Barkouk; of El Muayyad 137; of Ibn Touloun 136; of Kaït Bey 137 (82); of Kalaoun 137; of Sultan Hassan 137, 138 (81)
California. Spanish missions and churches 400. University of 413
Cambodia. Temple of Nakhon Wat 428
Cambray. Cathedral 200
Cambridge (England). Caius College, Gate of Honor 335. Fitzwilliam Museum 366. King's College Chapel 227, 231, 238. Trinity College Library 340
Cambridge (Mass., U. S. A.). Craigie (Longfellow) House 399 (224)
Canterbury. Cathedral 213, 226; central tower 232; chapels 235; transepts 235; minor works 239
Caprarola. Palace 305
Capua. Amphitheatre 102
Caria 72. (See Halicarnassus)
Carinthia 346, 347
Carlton House 367
Carlsruhe. Theatre 384. University buildings 384
Carter's Grove 398
Casamari. Abbey ruins 260
Caserta. Palace 309

CASTLE HOWARD 340
CÉRISY-LA-FORÊT. Church 180
CEYLON 417. Topes 418
CHAISE-DIEU. Cloister 216
CHÂLONS (Châlons-sur-Marne). Cathedral 208
CHALVAU. Château 321
CHAMBORD. Château 320 (182, 183)
CHANTILLY. ("Petit Château") 323
CHARLESTON. St. Michael's 397
CHARLOTTESVILLE. University of Virginia 402
CHARLTON HALL 335
CHARLTON-ON-OXMORE. Plate tracery (113)
CHARTRES. Cathedral 200, 201, 206; chapels 207; size 209; W. front 210; transept porches 211 (131); spires 212; capital from (127 c). Hospital 217
CHEMNITZ. Cathedral 253
CHENONCEAUX. Château 321, 323
CHIARAVALLE. Certosa 260, 266
CHICAGO. Auditorium Building 410, 412. Columbian Exposition 406, 408, 413. Fischer, Schiller Buildings 410
CHICHESTER. Cathedral aisles 236; spires 233; vaulting 225
CHIHUAHUA. Church 360
CHILLAMBARAM. Dravidian temple, Great Hall, Mantapa of Parvati 426
CHISWICK. Villa 336, 337
CHITTORE. Hindu temples 424. Palace 424. Towers 422 (231)
CLERMONT (Clermont-Ferrand). Cathedral 200, 208, 215. Notre Dame du Port 167, 207 (98, 99)
CLEVELAND (Ohio, U. S. A.). Public buildings 414
CLUNY. Abbey church 168. Houses 217. Hôtel de (at Paris) 219
CNOSSUS 43. Palace of Minos 47
COBLENTZ. Church of St. Castor 242
COIMBRA. Sta. Cruz 360
COLESHILL 337
COLOGNE. Apostles' Church 176, 247 (104). Cathedral 193, 195, 208, 246, 247, 248; plan 193, 247 (146); spires 245, 246; vaulting 244. Great St. Martin's 176, 247. Romanesque houses 178. St. Mary-in-the-Capitol 176
COMO. Broletto (town hall) 271. Campanile 164.
COMPIÈGNE. Town hall 257
COMPOSTELLA. St. Iago 182
CONJEVERAM. Dravidian temple 426
CONSTANTINE. Amphitheatre 92
CONSTANTINOPLE 120, 126. Byzantine monuments (list) 134. CHURCHES: of the Apostles 132; of Divine Wisdom (Hagia Sophia, St. Sophia) 111, 123, 124, 127, 131, 133, 150, 151 (72, 76, 77, 78); of Moné tes Choras 132; of St. Bacchus 127; of St. John Studius (Emir Akhor mosque) 118; of St. Sergius 117, 127, 128 (74). Cisterns 124. Early Christian monuments (list) 119. FOUNTAINS 152; of Ahmet III. 152. MOSQUES 150: of Ahmet II. (Ahmediyeh) 150 (89); of

Kahiré Djami 132; of Mehmet II. 150, 151 (88); of Osman III. (Nouri Osman) 151; of Soliman (Suleimaniyeh) 151 (90); of Yeni Djami 150. Palaces 153. Tchinli Kiosque (Imperial Museum) 153; sarcophagi in 68. Tombs, tomb of Roxelana 152
Copenhagen. Christiansburg 344. Exchange, Fredericksborg 344
Cordova 141. Great Mosque 142, 143 (84)
Corinth. Apollo temple 62
Coutances. Cathedral 200; chapels 208; spires 212
Coventry. St. Michael's 237
Cracow. Castle 346; chapel of Jagellons 346
Cremona. Town hall 271
Crete 47 (see Cnossus)
Ctesiphon. Tak Kesra 145
Cyprus 138

Damascus. Mosque of El-Walîd 136
Dandour. Temple 19
Dantzic. Town hall 352
Darmstadt. Houses of artist colony 392
Dashour. Pyramid 9
Deir-el-Bahari. Tomb-temple of Hatasu 15, 21
Deir-el-Medineh. Temple of Hathor 19
Dekkan 417, 424
Delhi. Jaina temples 422. Jumma Musjid 148. Mogul architecture 149. Palace of Shah Jehan 148. Pathan arches, etc. 148
Delos. Gates 45. Portico of Philip 68
Denderah. Temple of Hathor 17. Group of temples 22, 23, 24. Hathoric columns 24
Derri. Temple 22
Detroit. Majestic Building 410
Dieppe. Church of St. Jacques 216
Dijon. St. Michel 318
Dôl. Cathedral, east end 208
Dresden. Castle, Georgenflügel 350. Church of St. Mary (Marienkirche) 354 (201). Theatre 384 (218). University buildings 384. Zwinger Palace 354 (200)
Drügelte. Circular church 177
Dublin. Public buildings 365
Durham. Cathedral 179, 180, 224, 229 (105); central tower 232; Chapel of Nine Altars 235

Earl's Barton. Saxon tower 178
Ecouen. Château 323
Edfou. Great temple 16, 17, 22 (9, 10, 14). Peripteral temple 22
Edinburgh. High School, Royal Institution 366. Monuments to Burns and Dugald Stewart 367. University 341
Egypt. Early Christian buildings 118. Tombs 10, 11
El Djem 108
Elephantine. Temple of Amenophis III. 22
El Kab. Temple of Amenophis III. 18
Eleusis. Propylæa 70

Ellora. Chaityas 419. Kylas 427
Elne. Cloister 172, 216
Ely. Cathedral 224; choir vault 226; clearstory 229; interior 233; Lady Chapel 238; minor works 239; octagon 228, 238; size 236; towers 232
Ephesus. Temple of Artemis (Artemisium) 67; Ionic order 53. Palæstra 72
Epidaurus. Theatre 71
Erech 31
Escurial 358, 359, 360
Esneh. Hathoric columns 24. Temple 22, 108
Essen. Nun's choir 175
Esslingen. Church spire 245
Etchmiadzin. Byzantine buildings 134
Etruria. Tombs 88. Temples 89
Evreux. Cathedral 200
Ewerby. Church 237
Exeter. Cathedral 226 (134)
Ezra. Church of St. George 117

Feraig. Rock-cut temple 22
Ferrara. Cathedral 266, 308, 311. Churches 282, 298. Palaces Scrofa, Roverella 288
Firouzabad. Sassanian buildings 144
Florence. Bargello 271. Baptistery 162. Campanile 164, 268, 270 (152a, 159). Cathedral (Duomo, Sta. Maria del Fiore) 262, 263, 264, 268; dome 279 (152, 164, 165); façade 266; marble incrustations 268; nave 262 (148). Churches:— of Santa Croce 263; Pazzi chapel in same 281; pulpit in 286; Marsupini tomb in 286; of San Lorenzo, and Old Sacristy of same 281; of San Michele (Or San Michele) 268; of San Miniato 115, 162; of Sta. Maria Novella 261, 263; façade of same 281; fountain in sacristy of same 286; of San Spirito 281 (166). Loggia dei Lanzi 271. Loggia di San Paolo 285. Minor works 286. Ospedale degli Innocenti 285. Palaces:— Bartolini, Gondi, Guadagni, Larderel, Pandolfini, all 295; Pitti 284, 305, 325; Riccardi 284, 285, 286, 295 (167); Rucellai 285, 287; Serristori 295; Strozzi 285, 295 (168); Palazzo Vecchio 271 (160)
Flushing. Town hall (hôtel de ville) 342
Fontainebleau. Palace 318, 324
Fontevrault. Abbey church 166
Fontfroide. Cloister 216
Fonthill Abbey 386 *note*
Fossanova. Abbey ruins 260
France. Romanesque monuments (list) 173; Gothic monuments (list) 219, 220 Renaissance monuments (list) 332, 333
Frankfort. Salt House 354
Freiburg. Cathedral 244, 245, 248; spire 245
Freiburg im Erzgebirge. Golden Portal 247
Fritzlar. Church 248
Fulda. Monastery 175, 177

Furness. Abbey, pointed arches 223
Futtehpore Sikhri. Mosque of Akbar, etc. 148

Gandhara. Buddhist monasteries 419
Gaillon. Château 316
Gelnhausen. Abbey church 247. Castle ruins 178
Genoa. Campo Santo 391. Cathedral, west front 266. Loggia dei Banchi 306. Palaces: —Balbi, Brignole, Cambiasi, Doria-Tursi (Municipio), Durazzo (Reale), Guistiniani, Lercari, Pallavicini, Sauli, University, all 306, 307. Sta. Maria di Carignano 304
Gerasa 108
Germany. Mediæval 174. Romanesque monuments (list) 182. Gothic monuments (list) 256. Renaissance monuments (list) 361
Gernrode. Romanesque church 175
Gerona. Cathedral 188, 259
Ghent (Gand). Cloth hall 252
Gherf Hossein. Rock-cut temple 22
Ghertashi (Kardassy). Temple 22
Ghizeh. Pyramids 4; Pyramid of Cheops 7 (1, 2); of Chephren 8; of Mycerinus 8, 9; Sphinx, Sphinx temple 10 (3, 4)
Girnar. Jaina temples, Temple of Neminatha 421
Glasgow. Churches in Greek style 367
Gloucester. Cathedral 180, 224, 225, 226; central tower 232; cloister 227; east window 231; Lady Chapel 238
Goslar. Kaiserburg 178
Gournah. Columns 24. Temple 21
Gran. Cruciform chapel 346
Granada 141. Alhambra 142, 143, 144, 359 (83, 85). Cathedral 356, 358; tombs in same 360. Palace of Charles V. 359 (204)
Grange House 367
Great Britain. Norman monuments (list) 183. Gothic monuments (list) 240. Renaissance monuments 345
Guadalajara. Infantada 357
Gujerat 146
Gwalior. Jaina temples 422. Palace 424. Teli-ka-mandir 424. Tombs 424

Haddon Hall 334
Hague, The. Town hall 343
Halberstadt. Cathedral 249. Town hall 250
Halicarnassus. Ionic order 53. Mausoleum 4, 56 *note*, 72 (41)
Hämelschenburg. Castle (Schlos) 348, 352 (198
Hamoncondah. Temple 425
Hampton Court 334, 339
Hardwicke Hall 335
Hartford (Conn., U. S. A.). Churches 401. State Capitol 406
Hatfield House 335

Hauran. Roman works in the 92. Domestic buildings 117
Hecklingen. Church 175
Heidelberg. Castle 351 (199). Ritter House 354
Heilsberg. Castle 250.
Heldburg. Castle 350
Hengreave Hall 334
Herculanum 87. Amphitheatre 92. Houses 106. Theatre (61). Wall paintings 87
Hereford. Cathedral 180, 224, 236
Hierapolis. Early Christian buildings 118
Hildesheim 175. Kaiserhaus 354. Renaissance houses 353. St. Godehard 175. Town hall 250. Wedekindsches Haus 354
Holland House 335
Howard Castle 340
Hullabîd. Temples 424; double temple 424, 425 (234) Kait Iswara 424

Iconium (Konieh). Ruins 149
Iffley. Church 181 (107)
Iona. Abbey church 181
India 146-149. Moslem monuments (list) 154. Non-Moslem monuments (list) 430
Indianapolis. Public buildings 414
Innsbrück. Schloss Ambras 347
Ipsamboul (Abou-simbel). Grotto temples 21 (13)
Ireland. Celtic towers 178
Ispahan. Meidan (Meidan-Shah) 145. Mesjid Shah, Bazaar, Medress 146
Issoire. Church of St. Paul 167, 207
Italy. Early Christian monuments (list) 118-119. Romanesque monuments (list) 172-173. Gothic monuments (list) 273-274. Renaissance monuments (list) 311-313

Jaen. Cathedral 356, 358
Jamalgiri. Buddhist monastery 419
Japan 429
Jaunpore 146
Jedburgh. Abbey 181
Jerusalem. Castle of Antonia 40. Church of the Ascension 115. Early Christian churches 111. El Aksah 136. Golden Gate 40. Herod's temple 40, 83. Mosque of Omar (Dome of the Rock, Kubbet-es-Sakhrah) 116, 136. Octagonal church on temple site 116. Solomon's temple 40. Tomb of Absalom 40; of the Kings 39; of Zechariah 39. Wall of Lamentations 40. Zerubbabel's temple 41

Kairouân (Cyrene). Mosques 140
Kalabshé. Columns 11. Temple 22
Kalb Louzeh. Church 116 (69)
Kalburgah 146
Kanaruk. Hindu temples 422
Kantonnuggur. Hindu temple 423
Kardassy (Ghertashi). Temple 22, 108

KARLI. Chaityas 419
KARLSTEIN. Castle 280
KARNAK 19, 50. Ancient temple 13. Great Temple and Hypostyle Hall xxiii., 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 36 (11, 12). Polygonal columns 12, 13. Temple of Khonsu 16, 20
KASCHAU. Cathedral 250
KASR. Mound 31
KEDDLESTONE HALL 341
KELAT SEMAN. Church of St. Simeon Stylites, small double church 117
KELSO. Abbey 181
KHAJURAHO. Jaina temples 422. Kandarya Mahadeo 423
KHORSABAD. Palace of Sargon 31. City Gate 32 (19)
KIRKSTALL. Abbey, pointed arches 223
KÖNIGSBERG. Church 249
KOYUNJIK. Palaces of Assurbani-pal and Sennacherib 31
KUTTENBERG. Church of St. Barbara 244, 245

LAACH. Abbey 176
LABYRINTH of Moeris (Fayoum) 26
LAMBESSA 108
LA MUETTE. Château 321
LANDSHUT. Residenz 350. St. Martin's 245, 249
LANGRES. Cathedral 169
LAON. Cathedral 200, 208, 209, 211; grotesques 213; porches 211; towers 212
LAVAL. Cathedral (La Trinité) 203
LE MANS. Cathedral 200, 203, 208, 209 (123); tomb in 316
LEON. Cathedral 193, 254. Panteon of S. Isidoro 181, 182
LE PUY (Puy-en-Vélay). Abbey (now cathedral) 207; cloister 216
LEIPZIG. Fürstenhaus 354
LEMGO. Town hall 352
LEYDEN. Town hall 344
LICHFIELD. Cathedral 226, 229, 223 (140); spire 233; west front 239 (139)
LIÈGE. Archbishop's palace 342. Church of St. Jacques 251
LIMBURG-ON-THE-HARDT. Church 175
LIMBURG-ON-LAHN. Cathedral of St. George 244 (144). Abbey church 177
LIMOGES. Cathedral 200, 208, 214, 215
LINCOLN. Cathedral 224, 226, 229, 230, 236; chapter house 228; central tower 232; interior 233; west front 231
LISBON. Sta. Cruz near 360
LISIEUX. Cathedral 200
LIVERPOOL. St. George's Hall 367 (206)
LOIRE VALLEY. Churches, vaulting 167. (For châteaux of this valley see Azay-le-Rideau, Blois, Chambord, Chenonceaux)
LOMBARDY. Romanesque monuments 157-160
LONDON. Albert Memorial 388. Albert Memorial Hall 390. Bank of England 341, 365. British Museum 366 (205);

Elgin marbles in 58; mausoleum fragments in 72. Cathedral of St. Paul 337-339 (192, 193). CHURCHES:—Bow Church 339; St. George's, Bloomsbury 340; St. Martin's-in-the-Fields 340 (196); St. Mary's, Woolnoth 340; St. Pancras's 367; St. Paul's, Covent Garden 337; St. Stephen's, Walbrook 339; St. Stephen's Chapel, Westminster 338; Temple Church 223; Westminster Abbey 224, 226, 235, 239 (142); chapter house 228; Henry VII.'s chapel 195, 227, 231, 233 (141). Greenwich Hospital 340. Mansion House 341, 365. Middle Temple Hall 238. Natural History Museum 389 (222). New Law Courts 389. Newgate Prison 341. Parliament Houses 238, 388 (220). Royal Exchange 365. Somerset House 337, 340, 341. South Kensington Museum, new building 390. Westminster Abbey (see above). Westminster Hall 237. Whitehall Palace 336; Banqueting Hall of same 337 (192)

LONGLEAT HOUSE 335

LOUTH. Church 237

LOUVAIN. Cathedral 251, 252. Town hall 252 (149)

LÜBECK. Cathedral of St. Mary 246, 247, 249. City Gates 250. St. Catherine's 249. Town hall 250

LUCCA. Arcaded church façades 115. Campanile 270. Cathedral (S. Martino) 161, 262 263, 265 (154); tempietto in same 286; tomb of P. di Noceto in same 266 (169). Minor works 286, 287. Palazzo Pretorio, Pal. Bernardini 287. S. Frediano, S. Michele 161

LUPIANA. Monastery 358

LUXOR 19, 50. Temple 19, 20. Osirid piers 24

LUZ. Church 360

LYCIA. Tombs 37, 38, 39, 53

MADRID. Escurial 358, 359, 360. First palace 358. New palace 359

MADRID (Boulogne). Château 321

MADURA. Choultrie of Tirumalla Nayak 426. Great Hall 427. Great Temple, corridors 425, 426. Palace 427

MAFRA. Palace 360

MAGDEBURG. Cathedral 193, 246, 248

MAHAVELLIPORE. Raths 427

MAHRISCH-TRÜBAU. Castle portal 346

MAISONS. Château 329

MALAGA. Alcazar 142, 143. Cathedral 356

MALINES (Mechlin). Cathedral of St. Rombaut 251. Cloth hall 252. Hôtel du Saumon 342

MANCHESTER. Cathedral 236. Assize Courts 388 (221)

MANIKYALA. Tope 418

MANRESA. Collegiate Church 254

MANTINEA. Theatre 70

MANTUA. Campanile 270. Church of S. Andrea 281. Early Re-

naissance palaces 288. Palazzo del Té 293
MARBURG. St. Elizabeth 245, 246 (145)
MARCH. Church ceiling 238
MARIENBURG. Castle, Great Hall 256
MARIENWERDER. Castle 250
MARSEILLES. Chapel of St. Lazare 316. Fountain of Longchamps 381 (216)
MARYLAND. Manor houses, churches 398
MASHITA. Palace of Chosroes 145
MAULBRONN. Monastery 178
MAYENCE. Cathedral 176
MEAUX. Cathedral 214
MECCA. Kaabah 136
MEDINA. Mosque 136
MEDINA DE RIO SECO. Rood-screen 360
MEDINET ABOU. Osirid piers 24 (15). Pavilion of Rameses III. 26. Peripteral temple 22. Tomb-temple of Rameses III. 15, 19, 21
MEIDOUM. Stepped pyramid 9. Temple 11
MEISSEN. Albrechtsburg 250
MEROË. Pyramids 9
MERV 146
MESOPOTAMIA. Building materials 28
MESSINA. Cathedral ceiling 162. Fountains 309
METZ. Cathedral 249
MIDDELBURG. Town hall 252
MILAN 157. Arcade 391. Cathedral 248, 260, 262, 265, 267, 269. Domical churches 283. Ospedale Maggiore 287, 293. S. Ambrogio 158, 159, 163 (91). San Eustorgio, Portinari Chapel in, 287. S. Gottardo, campanile of 163. S. Lorenzo 127 *note*, 133. Sta. Maria delle Grazie 283, 293. S. Satiro 164; sacristy of 293
MILETUS. Temple of Apollo Didymæus 53, 67 (28)
MINDEN. Cathedral 249
MODENA 164
MŒRIS. Labyrinth 26
MOISSAC. Cloister 172, 216
MOLFETTA 162
MONREALE. Churches, cathedral, cloisters 162
MONS. Cathedral, St. Wandru 251, 252
MONTEPULCIANO. Church of S. Biagio 298, 310
MONTMAJOUR. Cloister 172, 216
MONT ST. MICHEL. Abbey 169, 170, 216; cloister of same 216
MORET. House of Francis I. 322
MOSCOW. The Kremlin 374
MOSUL 33, 146
MOUNT ABU. Jaina temples, Temple of Vimalah Sah 420 (232)
MOUNT ATHOS. Monastery 134
MUGHEIR. Temple of Sin or Hurki 30
MUJELIBEH. Mound 31
MUKTESWARA. Hindu temples 424
MÜLHAUSEN. Town hall 352
MUNICH 368, 374. Auekirche 383. Basilica 383. Cathedral 247. Frauenkirche 245. Glyptothek

369. Ludwigskirche 383. Propylæa 369 (208). Ruhmeshalle 368. St. Michael's 352
Münster. Church 248. Town hall 250
Münzenberg. Castle ruins 178
Mycenæ 47. Fortifications 44 (23). Lion Gate 45, 46 (22). Tholos of Atreus 45, 46, 148 (24, 25). Tombs 4
Mylassa. Tomb 72.
Myra. Theatre 70. Tombs 73
Mysore 424

Nakhon Wat 413
Naksh-i-Roustam (Persepolis) 36. Tomb of Darius 37
Nancy. Ducal Palace 219, 317
Nankin. Porcelain tower 428
Naples. Arcade 391. Arch of Alphonso 291. Church of Gesù Nuovo 308; of S. Francesco di Paolo 310, 373; of S. Lorenzo 268; of S. Severo (178). Minor works 286. Palazzo Cuomo, Pal. Gravina, Porta Capuana 291. Royal Museum 509. Royal Palace 310. Theatre San Carlo 310, 373. Towers 310, 311
Narbonne. Cathedral 200, 208, 214, 215
Nassick. Chaityas 419
Naukratis 43
Naumburg. Church 246, 248
Netherlands 250. Gothic monuments (list) 257
Neuweiler. Church of St. Peter and St. Paul 248
Nevers. St. Étienne 167
Newcastle. St. Nicholas 237
New Haven (Conn., U. S. A.). Churches 401
New Mexico. Spanish churches 400
Newport (R. I., U. S. A.). Town hall 400. Trinity Church 398
New York 405. American Surety Building, Broadway Chambers 409. Carnegie house 411. Casino theatre 412. Cathedral of St. Patrick 404. Century Club 412. City College 413. City Hall 401. Columbia University 413. Custom House, Old 403 (226); New 414. Grace Church 404. Law Library of Columbia University 413. Madison Square Garden 412. Metropolitan Club 412. Metropolitan Life Building 409. Phipps house 411. Post Office 404. Public Library 413, 414. Schwab house 411. Singer Building 409. St. Patrick's Cathedral 404. St. Paul's Church 398. Sub-Treasury 403. Times Building (229). Trinity Church 404. University Club 412. University of New York 413. Vanderbilt house 411. West Street Building 409
Nicomedia 150
Nîmes 108. Amphitheatre 92. Maison Carrée 93. Pont du Gard 107
Nimroud. Palaces of Assurnazir-pal, Esarhaddon and Shalmaneser 31, 32
Nineveh 31

Nippur (Niffer). Ruins 29, 31. Mycenæan house 44 *note*
Normandy 169, 171, 212. Romanesque clearstories 167. Romanesque churches 179, 180. Cathedrals of 200
North Germany. Brick churches 249
North Woburn. Rumford House 399
Norwich. Cathedral 179, 180, 224, 227. St. Stephen's 237, 238
Noyon. Cathedral 200, 203, 204, 206, 208, 209, 251
Nubia. Early Christian buildings 118
Nuremberg 243. Frauenkirche, St. Lorenz and St. Sebald churches 250. Funk, Hirschvogel and Peller houses 354. Renaissance houses 353. Shrine of St. Sebald 355. Town hall 352

Olympia. Altis, Echo Hall 70. Heraion 51, 63. Philippeion 56. Sculptures 58. Temple of Zeus 63
Oppenheim. St. Catherine's 244, 247, 249
Orange 108. Theatre 101
Orchomenos. Beehive tomb, ceiling 47
Orissa. Hindu temples, 422, 423, 424
Orléans. Houses 322. Town hall (hôtel de ville) 317
Orléansville 108
Orvieto. Cathedral 262, 264, 265; façade 265
Osnabrück. Church 248
Ottmarsheim. Church 175
Oudenärde. Town hall 252
Oudeypore. Hindu temples, palaces 424
Ourscamp. Hospital 217
Oxford. All Souls College 340. Cathedral (Christ Church) 224, 227. Christ Church Hall 237, 238. Divinity School 227. Merton College Chapel 238. New Museum 388. Radcliffe Library 340. Sheldonian Theatre 340. Town hall 390

Paderborn. Town hall 352
Padua. Arena chapel 263. Campanile 164. Palazzo del Consiglio 291
Pæstum. Basilica 70. Temples 62
Pailly. Château 323
Palermo. Cathedral 162, 163, 308. Churches of Eremitani, La Mortorana 162. La Ziza, la Cuba 144
Palmyra 84, 108. Temple of the Sun 92. Ceiling panels (50 *a*)
Parasnatha. Jaina temples 422
Paris. Arch of Triumph of the Carrousel 370, 371; of l'Étoile 370, 371 (209). Bourse 371. Castel Béranger 392. Cathedral (Nôtre Dame) 193, 200, 201, 203, 204, 205, 253 (119, 120, 127); capital from (129 *b*); chapels 207, 208; early carving (117); grotesques 213; rose windows 206, 215; size 209, 236; west front 210, 231 (127).

CHURCHES:—Chapel and Dome of the Invalides 328 (187); Madeleine 370, 371 (210); Panthéon 330, 370 (189, 190); Sacré Cœur at Montmartre 381; Sainte Chapelle 188, 206, 228 (109, 124); capital from same (129 *a*); Sorbonne 325; St. Augustin 379; Ste. Clothilde 379, 383; St. Étienne du Mont, St. Eustache 318; St. Jean de Belleville 379; St. Merri, St. Sévérin 216; St. Paul-St. Louis 325; St. Roch 325; St. Sulpice 325, 370 (188); St. Vincent de Paul 372; Val-de-Grâce 329. Collège Chaptal 378. Colonnades of Garde-Meuble 370, 375. Column of July (Colonne de Juillet) 373. Corps Législatif (Palais Bourbon) 371. École des Beaux-Arts 364, 378, 405; door of same (211); library 372; École de Médecine, new buildings 372. Exhibitions 382; of 1900 382, 392, 393. Fountains Cuvier, Molière, St. Michel 380. Halles Centrales 378. Hôtel-de-Ville (town hall) 321; new buildings 381. HÔTELS:—Carnavalet (de Ligéris) 322, 329; de Cluny 219; des Invalides 328; Lambert 329. House of Francis I. (Maison François I.) 322. Library of Beaux-Arts 372; of Ste. Geneviève 372. Louvre (see PALACES). Museum (Musée) Galliéra (217). Opera House (Nouvel Opéra) 380 (215). PALACES:—Palais Bourbon (Corps Législatif) 371; Pal. de l'Industrie 380; palace and baths of Julian 108; Pal. de Justice 372; Louvre and Tuileries 219, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 370, 379, 380 (184, 213, 214); Luxemburg 325 (185); Pal. Royal 329, 370. Pavillon Bleu at Exposition of 1900 392. PLACES: (Squares):—de la Concorde 330, 331; Royale (now des Vosges) 324; Vendôme 328. Railway stations (de l'Est, du Nord, d'Orléans) 380. Sorbonne church 325; new academic buildings 382

PATRINGTON. Church 237

PAULINZELLE. Romanesque church 175

PAVIA 157. Certosa 260, 266, 267, 268, 283, 288 (157, 158). Church of S. Michele 158, 159 (92). Domical churches 283

PEKING. Summer pavilion 429. Temple of Great Dragon 428.

PERGAMON (Pergamus). Altar of Eumenes II. 68. Christian buildings 118.

PÉRIGUEUX. St. Front 166 (94, 97)

PEROOV. Temple 426

PERSEPOLIS 35, 145. Columns 36, 37 (21). Hall of Xerxes 36, 37. Palaces 70

PERSIA 123. Moslem buildings 145, 156 (list 154). Sassanian buildings 144, 145 (see also PERSEPOLIS)

PERUGIA. Oratory of S. Bernardino 284. Town hall (Pal.

Communale 274. Roman gates 88
Peterborough. Cathedral 180, 224, 225; retro-choir 227; west front 231, 232
Petra. Necropolis 108
Phigalæa (Bassae). Gate 45. Sculptures 58. Temple of Apollo Epicurus 67
Philadephia. Centennial Exhibition 405. Christ Church 397 (223). Girard College 403. Independence Hall 400. Marine Exchange, Mint, 403. Municipal buildings 404
Philae 108. Great Temple (of Isis), peripteral temple 22
Piacenza 157. Campanile 163 (93). Cathedral 159 (93). Town hall 271
Piastenschloss (at Brieg) 351
Pienza 286. Pal. Piccolomini, etc. 287
Pierrefonds. Château 219, 371
Piræus. Arsenal 70
Pisa. Baptistery 161 (94). Cathedral (Duomo) 161 (94, 95). Churches 115, 266; minor works of early Renaissance in same 277, 286. Leaning Tower 161, 164 (94). Sta. Maria della Spina 269
Pistoja. Campanile 270. Churches 161. Podestà, Pal. Communale 271. Sta. Maria dell' Umiltà 298
Pittsburgh. Carnegie Building 409. Carnegie Library 411. County buildings 407
Plagnitz. Castle 351
Plassenburg. Castle 351
Poitiers. Cathedral 200, 203, 208
Pola. Amphitheatre 91, 102
Pompeii. Amphitheatre 92. Baths 86. Houses 73, 106, 107. House of Pansa (65). Theatre 101. Tombs 104. Wall paintings 87
Ponposa. Campanile 163
Pont du Gard. Bridge 107
Portsmouth (N. H., U. S. A.). Sherburne (Warner) House 399
Portugal 360. Gothic monuments (list) 258. Renaissance monuments (list) 361
Potsdam. St. Nicholas Church 368
Prague. Belvedere 347. Cathedral 244, 246, 247, 249. Palace on Hradschin, Schloss Stern, Waldstein palace 347
Prato. Churches 161, 298. Madonna delle Carceri 283
Prentzlau. Church 249
Prieue. Ionic Order 53; Propylæa 70
Provence 165
Provins. Houses 217
Puri. Temples 422. Temple of Jugganât 423
Purudkul. Rock-cut raths 427
Puy-en-Vélay (see Le Puy)

Raglan. Castle 334
Ramesseum (Thebes). Tomb-temple of Rameses II. 15, 19, 21, 23, 24 (8)
Ramisseram. Temple, corridors 425, 426
Ratisbon (Regensburg). Ca-

thedral 244, 246, 249. Town hall 250. Walhalla 368

Ravenna 114. Baptistery of St. John 126. Byzantine monuments (list) 134. Cathedral 308. Early Christian monuments 118. S. Apollinare Nuovo, S. Apollinare in Classe 115, 163, S. Vitale 117, 122, 127, 174 (73, 75)

Reggio. Amphitheatre 91

Reims 108. Cathedral 193, 200, 204, 205, 206, 208; portals 211, 212; size 209; towers 212; west front 211, 216, 231

Rhamnus. Themis temple 56 *note*

Rimini. S. Francesco 282

Rochester. Cathedral 229

Rodez. Cathedral 200, 214

Rome. Ancient monuments (list) 108. Amphitheatres: — Flavian (colosseum) 91, 92, 103, 290 (45, 62); of Statilius Taurus 101. Arches:—in general 76, 91, 102; of Constantine 81, 103 (63); of Septimius Severus 103; of Titus 91, 103; of Trajan 97, 103. Atrium Vestæ 106. Basilicas:—in general 76, 97; Basilica Æmilia 98; of Constantine xxiii. 82, 98, 99 (50 *b*, 58, 59); Julian 98; Sempronian 98; of Trajan (or Ulpian) 92, 97, 98 (57). (For early Christian basilicas see churches.) Baths (Thermæ): —in general 76, 92, 98; of Agrippa 91, 99; of Caracalla 87, 92, 100 (60); of Diocletian 92, 100; of Gallienus ("Minerva Medica") 122 *note*, 127; of Titus 86, 91, 99, 105. Bridges 107. Campaniles 163; of Campidoglio (capitol) 310. Capitol 91; palaces on same 304. Castle of St. Angelo 104. Churches:—in general 111, 298; church of Gesù 305; Sistine Chapel of Vatican 293; Sta. Agnese (basilica) 113; (modern church) 308; S. Agostino 291; S. Clemente 114; Sta. Castanza 111 (66); St. John Lateran 113, 308, 310; cloisters of same 285; S. Lorenzo 113, 114; S. Lorenzo in Miranda 93; S. Marco, porch 290; Sta. Maria degli Angeli 100; Sta. Maria dell' Anima, tower 311; Sta. Maria Maggiore 113, 310; chapel of Sixtus V. in same 301; Sta. Maria della Pace 295; Sta. Maria del Popolo 291; Chigi chapel in same 298; tombs in same 286; Sta. Maria della Vittoria 308; Sta. Maria Sopra Minerva 261; St. Paul-beyond-the-Walls 113, 285 (67, 68); St. Peter's, original basilica 113; existing church of 279, 280, 293, 294, 298, 303, 304, 328 (174, 175, 176); colonnade of same 300, 307, 375; sacristy of same 310; S. Pietro in Montorio, Tempietto in court of 293; S. Stefano Rotondo 136. Circus of Caligula and Nero 102, 113; Circus Maximus 102. Cloaca Maxima 82, 90. Colosseum or Flavian Amphitheatre (see

Amphitheatres). Columns:—of Marcus Aurelius 103; of Trajan 97, 103. Early Christian monuments 111; list of same 118. Fora:—in general 96; of Augustus 91, 96; of Julius, Nerva, Vespasian 96; Forum Romanum (or Magnum) 96, 98, 103; of Trajan 96, 97, 98 (57). Fountains:—Fonte (or Acqua) Felice, Fonte (or Acqua) Paolina 309; Fountain of Trevi 309, 310. Houses:—in general 104, 106, 107; of Vestals (Atrium Vestæ) 94, 106; of Livia (or Germanicus) 106. Lateran, carved ornament from Museum of (49); palace of 304. Mausoleum of Augustus, of Hadrian 104. Minor works of Renaissance in Rome 291. Monument of Victor Emmanuel 391. Museo delle Terme, paintings 107. National Museum 391. Palaces (ancient):—of Cæsars on Palatine 86, 91, 104; of Nero (Golden House) 91, 99, 105; Septizonium 105. Palaces (Renaissance):—in general 296; Altemps 296; Barberini 309, 310; of Capitol 304; Cancelleria 294, 296; Corsini 310; Farnese 296, 304 (172, 173); Farnesina 296; Giraud 294 (171); Laute, Massimi, Palma 296; Lateran, Quirinal 304; Sacchetti 296; Sapienza (University) 305. Vatican:—Belvedere (greater and lesser courts of) 295; Braccio Nuovo 295, 310, 373; Casino del Papa in gardens 297; Court of S. Damaso 295; Giardino della Pigna 104; Library 295; Loggie 294 *note*, 295; Scala Reggia 310. Palazzo di Venezia 290. Pantheon 83, 91, 92, 94, 96, 99, 113, 118, 122, 124, 127, 131, 310, 373 (54, 55, 56). Pons Ælius (Ponte S. Angelo) 107. Porta Maggiore 108. Portico of Octavia 91. Septa Julia 91. Septizonium 105. Temples:—of Castor and Pollux (Dioscuri) 85, 91, 93 (44); of Concord 93; of Faustina 93; of Fortuna Virilis 89, 90, 93 (51); of Hercules or "Vesta" 90; of Julius 93; of Jupiter Capitolinus 69, 89, 91; of Jupiter Stator so-called (see T. of Castor and Pollux); of Jupiter Tonans 91; of Mars Ultor 91; of "Minerva Medica" (Baths of Gallienus) 122 *note*, 127; of Peace 98; of Trajan 97; of Venus and Rome 94 (53); of Vesta in Forum 94; of "Vesta" or Hercules 90. Theatres:—in general 100; of Marcellus 91, 101 (42); of Mummius 100; of Pompey 101. Tombs:—86, 104; of Augustus, of Caius Sextius, of Cecilia Metella, of Hadrian 104; of Helena 118. Villas:—in general 105, 107, 297; Albani, Borghese 309; Lante, Madama, Medici, Pia, Pope Julius 297

Rosenborg. Castle 344

Rosheim. Church façade 177
Rothenburg. Town hall 352
Rouen 316. Cathedral 195, 200, 204, 208; open gable (130); rose windows 215; size of 209; west front 210. Hôtel Bourgtheroude 322. Palais de Justice 217. St. Maclou 216. St. Ouen 216, 383; rose window from same (215)
Rouheiha. Early Christian church 116
Royal Domain 167
Ruanwalli. Topes 418
Rue. Chapel of St. Esprit 216
Russia 374. Byzantine monuments 134

Sadri. Temple 421
Sakkarah. Pyramid 8
Salamanca. Casa de las Conchas 357. Cathedral (old) 182, 253; (new) 254, 356. Collegio de las Irlandeses 358. Monastery of S. Girolamo 356. S. Domingo 356. University 357; portal of same (202)
Salisbury. Cathedral 224, 225, 229, 233 (132); chapter house 228 (137); cloister (137); spire 232, 233, 237; transepts 235; west front 232. Market cross 239
Salonica. Church of St. George 118. Other monuments (list) 134
Salsette. Viharas 420
Salzburg. Church of St. Francis 246
Samarkhand 146
Samos. Gate 45
Sanchi. Brahman temple 419. Tope 418
San Golgano. Abbey ruins 260
San Ildefonso. Palace 360
Saragossa. Casa de Zaporte 357 (203)
Saxony 175
Schalaburg. Castle 347
Schettstadt. Cathedral 244
Schloss Hämelschenburg 348, 352 (198)
Schloss Porzia at Spital 346
Schloss Stern at Prague 347
Schwarz-Rheindorf. Church 176
Schweinfurth. Town hall 352
Scinde 146
Secundra. Tomb of Akbar 148
Sedinga. Hathoric columns 24
Séez. Cathedral 200
Segovia. Cathedral 193, 254, 356. Church of S. Millan, of Templars 182
Selinus. Temples 49, 56 *note;* northern temple 62; Zeus temple 62
Semneh. Pavilion 26
Senlis. Cathedral 200, 203, 212
Sens. Archbishop's palace 322. Cathedral 206, 209, 223
Serbistan. Sassanian buildings 144
Seringham. Temple 426
Seville 141. Alcazar 142, 143. Casa de Pilato (House of Pilate) 142, 358. Cathedral 248, 254, 262, 359. Giralda 142, 143, 359
Sfax. Mosques 140
Shepree. Pathan arches 148
Sherburne. Church vaulting 227

Shrewsbury. Abbey 180
Sicily 62. Moslem buildings 144, 162
Sidon. Sarcophagi from 68
Sienna. Brick houses 272. Campanile 270. Cathedral (Duomo) 261, 264, 265, 266 (155); west front 265 (155). Loggia del Papa 286. Minor works 277, 286. Palaces: — Buonsignori 272; Del Governo, Piccolomini, Spannocchi 286; Grotanelli 272; Pal. Pubblico 271; Saraceni 272. Renaissance churches 298. S. Giovanni in Fonte 264
Silchester. Roman villa 108
Silsileh. Grotto temple 22
Sivas. Ruins in 148
Soissons Cathedral 200, 203, 206, 208, 248
Somnath. Jaina temple 421
Somnathpur. Temples 424
Southwell. Minster 180; carving from same (118)
Spain 141, 355. Gothic monuments (list) 257. Romanesque churches 181, 182
Spalato. Palace of Diocletian 92, 105, 114 (64)
Spital. Schloss Porzia 347
Spires (Speyer). Cathedral 176 (103)
St. Alban's. Tombs, etc., in Abbey 239
St. Augustine. Fort Marion (S. Marco) 400. Hôtel Ponce de Leon 412. Cathedral 400
St. Benoît-sur-Loire. Antechurch 179
St. Denis. Abbey (now cathedral) 200, 201, 203, 205, 206 (123); tomb of Louis XII. in same 322; of Francis I. 323
St. Germain-en-Laye. Château 319; royal chapel in same 207
St. Gilles (near Arles). Church 167
St. Louis (Mo., U. S. A.). Union Trust Building 409. Washington University 413
St. Paul (Minn., U. S. A.). Minnesota State Capitol 413
St. Petersburg 374, 375. Admiralty 375. Cathedral of St. Isaac 375 (212). Churches: —of the Citadel, of the Greek Rite 374; of Our Lady of Kazan 375. New Museum, Palace of Grand Duke Michael 375. Smolnoy Monastery 377
St. Rémy 108. Tombs 104
Stabiæ 92
Stendal. Cathedral 245
Stockholm. Palace 344
Strasburg. Cathedral 248; pulpit in same (116); spire of same 243, 245, 246, 248. University buildings 384
Stuttgart. Old Castle 351. Technical School 384
Styria 347
Sully. Château 323
Sultaniyeh. Tomb 145
Sunium. Propylæa 70
Susa 145. Palaces 35, 38
Syracuse. Theatre 71
Syria 92, 114, 122. Early Christian churches 115, 116, 117; list of same 119

Tabriz. Ruined mosque 145

Tafkhah. Early Christian church 116
Takt-i-Bahi. Monastery 419
Tängermünde. Church 249
Tanjore. Great temple 426. Palaces 427. Shrine of Soubramanya 426 (235)
Tarputry. Gopura 426
Tebessa 108
Teheran 146
Tel-el-Amarna 27
Telmissus. Tomb 39
Tewkesbury. Abbey 180, 226 (135)
Thebes. Amenopheum 15. Rameseum 15 (8)
Thibet. Lamaseries 429
Thoricus. Gate 45. Stoa Diple 70
Tibur. See Tivoli
Timgad 108
Tinnevelly. Dravidian temples 426
Tiruvalur. Dravidian temples 426
Tiryns 43, 44, 45, 47
Tivoli. Circular temple 90, 366 (52)
Tlemcen. Mosques 140
Todi. Madonna della Consolazione 298
Tokio. Great Palace 430
Toledo 141. Archbishop's Palace 358. Cathedral 193, 253. Gate of S. Martino 358. Hospital of Sta. Cruz 356. S. Juan de los Reyes 256
Tonnerre. Hospital 217
Torcello. Campanile 163
Torgau. Hartenfels Castle 350
Toro. Collegiate church 182
Toulouse. Cathedral 207, 214. Church of St. Sernin 167, 204 (100). Houses 323
Tournay. Cathedral 193, 251; rood-screen in same 342
Tours 316. Cathedral 200, 208, 211; tomb of children of Charles VIII. in same 316; towers of same 319; west front of same 216
Trausnitz. Castle 350
Treves (Trier). Cathedral 177. Frauenkirche (Liebfrauenkirche, Church of Our Lady) 193, 247, 248 (147). Porta Nigra 108
Troy 43, 44
Troyes. Cathedral 200, 204, 208; façade 216; size of same 209; west portals 211. Ste. Madeleine 216. St. Urbain 215
Trunch. Church ceiling 238
Tucson. Church 360
Tuparamaya. Topes 418
Turin. Church of La Superga 373
Turkey 149. Monuments (list) 154
Tusculum. Amphitheatre 92
Tyrol 346, 347

Udaipur (near Bhilsa). Hindu temples 424
Ulm. Cathedral (Minster) 243, 244, 248; spire of same 246
Ur 30
Urbino. Ducal palace 291
Utrecht. Cathedral 249

Valencia 141. Cathedral 254
Valladolid. Cathedral 358. S. Gregorio, portal (151)

Vellore. Gopura 426
Vendôme. Cathedral, portal 211
Venetia 157, 267, 311
Venice 305. Gothic style in 260, 272, 273; tracery 263. Campaniles 163; of St. Mark, of S. Giorgio Maggiore 311. Churches:—Frari S. M. (Gloriosa dei Frari) 261; Redentore 304; S. Giobbe 289; S. Giorgio dei Grechi 298; S. Giorgio Maggiore 304, 311; SS. Giovanni e Paolo 261; Sta. Maria Formosa 298; S. M. dei Miracoli 288, 289; S. M. della Salute 308 (179); St. Mark's 132, 164, 273, 289 (79, 80); Library of same 305 (177); S. Salvatore 298; S. Zaccaria 288. Doge's Palace 273, 289 (162). Minor works 291. Palaces:—in general 273, 289; Cà d'Oro, Cavalli, Contarini-Fasan 273; Cornaro (Corner de Cà Grande) 305; Dario 290; Ducale (Doge's Palace) 273, 289 (162); Foscari 273; Grimani 305; Pesaro 309; Pisano 273; Rezzonico 309; Vendramini (Vendramin-Calergi) 290 (170); Zorzi, capital from (163). Scuola di S. Marco 288
Vercelli. S. Andrea 261, 268
Verneuil. Château 323
Verona 157, 163. Amphitheatre 91, 102. Campanile 163, 270. Church of Sta. Anastasia 261, 263; of S. Zeno 159, 160, 163, 177. Gates 305. Palaces:—in general 288; Bevilacqua, Canossa 305; del Consiglio 291; Pompei, Verzi 305. Tombs of Scaligers 269
Versailles. Palace 326. Petit Trianon 370
Vézelay. Abbey church 168, 170, 179, 201, 206
Vicenza 305, 306. Basilica 306. Palaces:—in general 288, 305; Barbarano, Chieregati, Prefetizzio, Tiene, Valmarano 306. Villa Capra 306, 336
Vienna 354, 355, 385. Arsenal at Wiener Neustadt 347. Burgtheater 384. Cathedral (St. Stephen) 244, 245, 246, 250; spire of same 245. Church of St. Charles Borromeo 367. Imperial Library 354. Imperial Palace, portal 347. Museums 384. Opera house 384. Palaces 354. Parliament House (Reichsrathsgebäude) 369, 384. Residence block (Maria-Theresienhof) 386 (219). Sta. Maria in Gestade 250. Town hall 386. University 384, 386. Votiv-Kirche 383
Vijayanagar. Palace 427
Vincennes. Royal chapel 207
Viterbo. Fountains 309. Houses 272. Town hall (Pal. Communale) 271. Villa Lante 297
Volterra. (Volaterræ). Gate 88

Waltham. Abbey 180. Eleanor's Cross 239
Warfield. St. Michael's, window (114)

WARKA (Erech). Palace-terraces 31
WARTBURG. Castle 178
WASHINGTON (D. C., U. S. A.). Capitol 401, 403, 404 (225); dome 403. Congressional Library 412, 414. Patent Office 402. State, Army and Navy Building 404. Treasury 402. White House 402
WELLS. Cathedral 226, 230, 236; chapter house 228 (136); west front 232
WESTMINSTER. See LONDON
WESTONZOYLAND. Ceiling of St. Mary's (143)
WESTOVER. House 398
WEST POINT (N. Y., U. S. A.). Military Academy 413
WIENER-NEUSTADT. See VIENNA
WILLIAMSBURG (Va., U. S. A.). Town hall 397
WILTON HOUSE 337
WINCHESTER. Cathedral 180, 224, 226, 230, 233 (106); tombs, etc., in same 239. Market Cross 239
WINDSOR. St. George's Chapel 227, 231, 238 (138)
WISMAR. Castle (Fürstenhof) 350. City Gates 250
WOBURN. Public Library (228)
WOLLATON HALL 335
WOLFENBÜTTEL. Marienkirche 352
WOLTERTON. Castle 334
WORANGUL. Kurti Stambha 425
WORCESTER. Cathedral 236
WORMS. Minster (cathedral) 176 (102)
WÜRZBURG. University Church 353

XANTEN. Church 247
XANTHUS. Nereïd monument 72

YORK. Cathedral 105, 229, 231; chapter house 228; minor works in 229; tower 232; west front 231
YPRES. Cloth hall 252

ZÜRICH. Polytechnic School 384
ZWETTL. Abbey 245, 246, 247

DATE DUE

GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U S A

NA 200 -2- 05577
H2 1911 c. 3 Hamlin History of Architecture.

J. Mellon	JAN 24 '56
K Finbergia	OCT 16 '56
Lucas	JAN 27
B Hill	DEC 16 '58
B. Hill	JAN 5 '59
B-Hill	JAN 21 '59

NA
200
H2
1911
c. 3

Hamlin

05577

00035584